THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by Canon E. G. Selwyn, D.D., Redhill Rectory, Rowlands Castle, Hants, to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. XX JANUARY, 1930 No. 115

EDITORIAL

The September number of *Laudate*,* the quarterly magazine of the Benedictine Community at Nashdom, contains a brilliant review of Canon Streeter's *The Primitive Church*, which deserves to be widely read at the present time. The reviewer makes two main points. Addressing himself first to the use which Canon Streeter makes of such N.T. passages as Acts xiii. 1, 1 Cor. xii. 28, and Rom. xii. 6-8, he insists that St. Luke and St. Paul mean what they say, say what they mean, and say one thing at a time; and that on no fair or level-headed principles of exegesis can any particular theories of Church Order be squeezed out of these passages. His second point is that Canon Streeter's account of the development in the Antiochene Church from a supposed primitive "Independency" to the mon-episcopacy of Ignatius involves a series of surmises, psychologizings, and special pleadings which are really preposterous. The reviewer notes a further characteristic of the book which, he says, marks its "real disqualification . . . to be considered in any true sense as a 'history' of the primitive Church"—namely, the absence of any mention of Him whom the Apostles knew as "the Spirit of Jesus"; and he adds that "*Hamlet* without the Prince of Denmark would be as coherent as that history stands without some such explanation."

We draw attention to this review, because it strikes us as far the most penetrating criticism we have yet seen of the book in question; and it is written throughout with a crispness of wit and good humour which are all too rare in theology and are worthy of Canon Streeter himself. It is not the only occasion in recent years, we may add, when *Laudate* has seemed to represent the best traditions of Anglican scholarship; and we hope that its intrinsic merits may attract many subscribers.

---

* To be obtained from the Editor, Nashdom Abbey, Burnham, Bucks. Price 1s.; annual subscription, 4s. 6d. post free.

The Education Report presented to the Church Assembly at its last session has had a mixed reception; and the reason is not perhaps difficult to guess. It lies in the fact that, on the one hand, a movement for the repeal or amendment of the Cowper-Temple clause is not now an immediate issue, and that the Majority Report is right in directing attention first to the need of securing public assistance for Church schools where that is necessary to enable them to play their part in educational developments under the Hadow scheme; while, on the other hand, the principles underlying the Majority Report are so vague and indistinct that they cannot commend themselves to Churchmen. Hardly anything, for instance, is said about membership in the Church, which is the cardinal presupposition of the Church's theory of education; and it is assumed that "simple Bible Teaching" can take the place of the teaching of the Creed and Christian Faith. As regards Sunday instruction, again, nothing is said of the place of catechizing by the priest, a feature of religious instruction for which the Sunday Schools cannot be a substitute.

Other issues in the Report will also call for comment and consideration. The powers proposed to be conferred on the new Council of Education will need most careful scrutiny, if we are to ensure that work now done, and done admirably, by the S.P.C.K. (among other bodies) is not to be drawn up into the voracious maw of the Press and Publications Board of the Church Assembly. Again, a point not dealt with in the Report, but one that is of importance in country districts, where children of twelve to fifteen may have to travel some miles to their Central School, arises in connexion with the care and discipline of the children during their journeys. Disquieting evidence exists as to the harm into which children may fall in this way; and it may be urged that the Church should endeavour to secure that some proper supervision of the children on their journeys should be provided by the educational authorities or otherwise.

Meanwhile interest chiefly turns upon the response which the Government will make to the Church's request. The justice of our claim is undeniable, and it comes at a moment when the State and the Local Authorities are asking the help of School Managers in a far-reaching educational development. The Church has made it clear that it desires to co-operate, but it is bound to emphasize its special trusteeship for the religious basis and character of education. We must not be surprised if the State on its side should emphasize its special trusteeship for

the technical efficiency of its educational organization. But the two causes are not inharmonious, and both should be advanced, provided that major issues of policy, such as the Cowper-Temple clause, are left alone. Meanwhile it is vital that, until the Government's policy is known and its bearings fully understood, no existing Church schools should be surrendered or compromised.

---

*New Testament Problems** is the title of a volume of collected articles and papers, several of which Dr. Lowther Clarke has contributed to THEOLOGY and other journals during the last few years. They belong to a type of very valuable New Testament work, which recalls the names of scholars like Archbishop Trench and Frederick Field, where particular passages are subjected to detailed study and exegesis; and the result is that many a point hitherto obscure is illuminated. These studies are, moreover, always easy to read, and afford admirable examples of how orthodoxy and criticism can be mated. Those who wish to realize afresh the perennial interest of New Testament theology could not do better than take this book as their guide. They will find problems such as the Virgin Birth, the Gospel miracles, the origins of Christianity, the Christological passage in *Philippians*, handled here in a new and enlightening atmosphere; and that alone will be a spiritual privilege.

Another book which has recently reached us is Dr. Alington's *Doubts and Difficulties*.† Mr. Edward Shillito has aptly christened it "Theology without Tears"; and those who have not only read it, but remember hearing the Headmaster of Eton *say* it—in pupil-room, for instance, or it might be in Lower Passage—will endorse the title. The present writer at any rate can testify to the exhilarating effect which teaching of this kind had on a generation of boys twenty-five years ago. It made us realize that the Christian faith not only had a great deal to say for itself *in foro intellectus*, but was also the thing best worth while in the world. Another delightful feature of this book is the way in which some of the bubbles of our day are pricked—such as the notion that we should revise our conception of God because the stars are discovered to be further off than we thought they were, or that the Gospel story is proved false by its inconsistencies of detail, or that religious truth ought to be perfectly simple. The reader will be astonished to find how much ground is covered in less than 200 pages. He will laugh on almost every page, and then he will go and lend it to his friends.

* By W. K. Lowther Clarke, D.D. S.P.C.K., 1929. 7s. 6d. net.
† Longmans, 1929. 5s. net.

JEWISH CHRISTIANITY: THE APOSTOLIC DECREE OF ACTS XV. AND THE APOSTOLIC CHURCH ORDERS—I*

SOMEONE—I think it was the late Dr. Hatch—defined history as the search for differences: but it is no less true that history is the search for agreements, and the main task which I have set before myself in these papers is to try and work out the implications of an agreement which I seem to detect in certain forms of early Christian literature. There are on the way two special things that I want to do: the one is to interpret the Apostolic Decree of Acts xv., and the other is to show up the Didache in its true colours.

I put in the foreground of my title the words Jewish Christianity, and therefore I shall begin with trying to make clear what I understand by Jewish Christianity as we get it in the New Testament, and especially in the Acts. Of course, there is a broad difference in some respects between the Jewish Christianity of Jerusalem and Palestine and the Jewish Christianity of the Dispersion, and I do not in the least want to overlook that difference. But I am writing here primarily of Jewish Christianity as we see it in Palestine and Jerusalem, and of the Church that succeeded to the Jewish Christians of the early days in Jerusalem, if only because that is the one form of Jewish Christianity which survived the Apostolic Age. The Jewish Christianity of the Dispersion either disappeared or was swallowed up very quickly in Gentile Christianity, in the large living, vital current of the Christianity round about it. So by Jewish Christianity I mean the Christianity of the Church of Jerusalem, and that goes back to the very beginning of things; it is the Christianity of those Christians who were converted in the first days. It is their Christianity that is represented to us in the first chapters of Acts: so far as I can see, what St. Luke gives us in the first period of Acts is not so much written from the point of view of the Apostolic preaching, as from the point of view of the Jewish audience. I think we have an extraordinarily faithful representation of what they believed; I do not suppose it possible that St. Peter's sermons in the first chapters of Acts represent the whole of what St. Peter believed, but I think they do represent the whole of what was put before the Jews of Jerusalem, that which did succeed in gaining a

* The first of these two papers reproduces in substance a public lecture given in Oxford on November 5, 1929. I must beg the indulgence of my readers if some traces of its original form survive in these pages.

hearing, and did succeed in producing a large body of Jewish converts.

Now what was the Christianity taught to them? Three things they learned as Christians: that Jesus of Nazareth had risen from the dead, that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah of prophecy, and that the Gentiles would come into the new Messianic Kingdom. But as to this third point, of course, they believed—and the Apostles still believed—that that Gentile incoming would be through Judaism; no one at that stage in the history of Christianity ever supposed that Gentiles would become Christians without first of all submitting to the Law.

These first Jewish Christians, then, superposed the new *credenda* on to their Jewish religion without finding anything inconsistent between the two. Let me just take two or three citations to illustrate this. Acts vi. 7: "A great multitude of the priests were obedient to the faith": but we are not to think that these priests gave up their priesthood. A little later, in x. 45 and xi. 2, we meet the phrase "the faithful of the circumcision." That is possibly a phrase of St. Luke's, reading back the contrast of a rather later moment, since the faithful who were not of the circumcision consisted at that moment, so far as we know, of Cornelius and his household. Acts xv. 5: "There rose up certain of the sect of the Pharisees who had believed"; that is to say, it was not the case, as it was with Gentile converts, that the acceptance of Christianity was something so new, was a step so drastic, that you forgot anything about the man's antecedents at all and called him simply a "Christian." These people are rather "ex-Pharisee Christians." For it is too easily overlooked that there was a vast difference in the attitude of Pharisees and of Sadducees towards our Lord. True, our Lord's denunciations are directed against the Pharisees; but that is simply because in Galilee He met a great many Pharisees and no Sadducees at all. In the story of the Passion, where the scene is laid at Jerusalem, the Sadducees at once come into prominence as the principal opponents of our Lord, and the same is the case in Acts with regard to the Apostles. And though it was inconceivable that a Sadducee should believe without giving up his Sadduceeism, it was not inconceivable that a Pharisee should believe and still be known to be a Pharisee. They were, if only up to a certain point, represented by James the brother of the Lord. He is not mentioned in the early part of Acts at all; we do not come across him till xii. 17—that is to say, when Peter disappeared from Jerusalem after his arrest and escape. On that occasion Peter sends a message to "James and the brethren"—*i.e.*, to James and the Church of Jerusalem. When we come to the fifteenth

chapter James is repeatedly mentioned in the story of the Council, in connection sometimes with the "presbyters," sometimes with the "brethren."

Such were the beginnings of Christianity, and such the development of Jewish Christianity in the first half of Acts. These Jewish Christians were, of course, at that time the main body of the Church—not, indeed, the whole body, because there were also the original disciples of Jesus, the Apostles, the rulers of the Church, who as time goes on cease to be so relatively prominent in Jerusalem, because their main function was that of missionaries, and they were not, like James and the elders, permanently settled in the mother Church. But, naturally and necessarily, at the beginning the Apostles, who were the preachers of the new religion, stand in unquestioned prominence. They are mentioned time after time in the first period.

Let me say in passing* that that wonderfully artistic historian who is Luke has planned his book in a series of panels, as we may say, which I am quite sure he means us to attend to and remember all along. So far as the first part of the book goes, the period ends at vi. 7: "And the word of God increased; and the number of the disciples multiplied in Jerusalem greatly; and a great company of the priests were obedient to the faith." Secondly, at ix. 31: "Then had the churches rest throughout all Judæa and Galilee and Samaria, and were edified; and walking in the fear of the Lord, and in the comfort of the Holy Ghost, were multiplied." Thirdly, xii. 24: "But the word of God grew and multiplied. And Barnabas and Saul . . ." I these first three periods of the Acts Paul has only so far a subordinate position: but it is not without significance that the third period opens with mention of his name. In the last three periods of the book Paul is the leading figure: and the first of these (or fourth of the continuous series) begins with the first missionary journey. But that is to anticipate.

In the first period, then, "the Apostles" are the body regularly recognized as the leaders of the Church. Peter is always the spokesman, and twice the phrase is "Peter and the Apostles"; but, speaking generally, though Peter is the leader and the spokesman, the characteristic phrase of the first period is "the Apostles." In the second period, from vi. 8 to ix. 31, there are only two or three references to the Apostles, but all worth close attention. In viii. 1 "they were all scattered abroad throughout the regions of Judæa and Samaria—except the apostles." Why? Naturally, that can only mean that the

* So far as I know, I was the first scholar to call attention to this (as I think) very striking feature of Acts; see the article "Chronology of the New Testament" in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, i. (1898) 421*b*.

Apostles had stood aside from the development of the preaching of St. Stephen. They had not disowned him—far from it—but they had not taken any active part in support. The authorities had no knowledge of their being supporters, and so they were left alone, while everyone who had been active in supporting Stephen had to flee. Secondly, in viii. 14, after the report of Philip's preaching in Samaria, the Apostles "sent Peter and John"; that is to say, they accepted Philip's work in Samaria. Nowhere, never, would they refuse converts. They might keep silent when Stephen was developing a new, or what seemed to be a new, argument about the Law and the Temple. It was another matter when converts were being brought to Christ; that was the one thing all through which united Christians, whatever their particular frame of mind. Thirdly, and what is most important, in ix. 27 "Barnabas took him [Paul] and brought him to the apostles." The new movement is brought into touch with the original centre of the work.

In the third period, which begins in ix. 31 and ends in xii. 24, we have what is really a fresh development (though I am not sure how far it has been recognized as such), in which the central person is Peter, in a way in which Peter by himself had never been central so far. Instead of the body of the Apostles, it is now Peter. One might call this period *Acta Petri*, "the acts of Peter." St. Luke quite certainly wants us to realize that, whatever view the rest of the Jewish Christians took, Peter was from the first, as soon as the matter really came before him, committed to the policy of Paul. The story of the conversion of Cornelius is the only thing in the Acts, except the conversion of St. Paul, which is told three times, and that is because it was so central, so important, so critical. Not the Council of Jerusalem, but the conversion of Cornelius, is the true pivotal point of the Book of Acts. Then first a Gentile was admitted to baptism without circumcision, and that by the principal Apostle. Not, of course, except under pressure and with reluctance: for nowhere is the overruling direction of the Spirit more definitely emphasized than in the episode of Cornelius.

Now Peter in this acted apart from the Apostles. In xi. 1 "the Apostles and the brethren in Judæa heard that the Gentiles, too, had received the word of God." That is to say, Peter's was the only responsibility involved: the rest, Apostles as well as brethren, realized that what had happened was something quite new. It was not the case of proselytes, people who had already come into Judaism from Paganism, being accepted for Christian baptism; the crucial intervening step was omitted, and Pagans became Christians direct. "And they of the circumcision disputed with Peter because he had gone in to

men uncircumcised and eaten with them." But they could not, and did not, refuse assent: xi. 18 "When they heard these things, they held their peace, and glorified God, saying, Then hath God to the Gentiles, too, granted repentance unto life." Therefore it is not the Council of Jerusalem, it is this story of Cornelius, which is central. It was then that under the guidance of St. Peter the Gentiles received, and were recognized as having received, "repentance unto life."

We may put that in another way. I doubt if it is exaggerating the real implications of the evidence if one says that from henceforward Peter is the link with Paul, and the Apostles as a body are the link with the Jewish Christians: that is to say, there were links all along, from the right all the way to the left. There was nowhere any break, because all were united in something that transcended any difference: that is to say, in their loyalty to Jesus Christ and their desire to spread His Kingdom.

We have now got to take into consideration a new type of Christianity, the type represented by Paul and Barnabas. Nothing is more important than to remember Paul's desire to keep in touch with those who were in Christ before him. Paul could on occasion be very violent, very definite, very clear in his own defence; but we have only to look at the Epistle to the Galatians itself, and especially the visits which he admits paying and their reason, to see that there is another quite different side of Paul to take into account. In Gal. i. 18 he went up to Jerusalem "to visit Cephas"; not simply to see him, but to get out of him all his recollections of the Lord's life and teaching. Again, when he tells us of the second visit in Gal. ii. 2, what did he do? "I referred my Gospel to them," "lest by any means I should have run in vain." In other words, the Apostle was anxious at all costs to avoid anything like a schism. There was one preaching of Christ, one Church that preached it, and Paul was supremely anxious to keep in living touch with the Christians of Jerusalem. No doubt it was, as a matter of fact, largely through St. Peter that things went well. But the point was that Paul had preached, and preached successfully; and that in the eyes even of Jewish Christians covered many deficiencies. On his side, St. Paul made every effort to win the support of the Christians in Jerusalem; and, though he does not say anything about the Jewish Christians as a body, he did suppose when he preached to the Galatians that he had the support of the leading people—Peter, John, and James—at headquarters.

But a crisis was to come. After St. Paul's first missionary journey he returned, probably in the autumn of 48, to Antioch, and wintered there. It is, I think, clear from all the indications that the missionary journey had been a tremendous success;

and news travels very fast among Orientals. The Jerusalem Christians very soon got wind of what had happened. Paul had been preaching to Gentiles, and telling them that they could be baptized and become perfectly good Christians without keeping the Law. St. Paul had realized, as anyone of his supreme quickness and clearness of insight was bound soon to realize, that the mass of Gentile inhabitants of the Greco-Roman world would never be won to any religion which involved what was to them the repulsive rite of circumcision; and he believed to the inmost fibre of his being that the whole Law was fulfilled and swallowed up in Christ. But to the Jewish Christians, with their very inchoate Christology, the Law had still an independent value. As we shall see, they were prepared in the end to make concessions to the Pauline view, to distinguish between what was and what was not of universal binding force—binding, that is, on Gentile as well as Jew. But their first instinct was hostile: the Law was being attacked and dethroned.

Now, of course, any Jewish Christian opposition was hampered by the undoubted fact that Cornelius had been admitted to Christian baptism, and we do not know—St. Luke does not tell us enough to enable us to see for ourselves—how they got round that difficulty; whether they said that was an exceptional case and the Spirit had directed Peter, or that, even if under such circumstances you might be admitted to baptism, you ought to follow it up with circumcision, or simply that that step had been over-hasty and must be reconsidered. We do not know what excuse they used. But we do know that they went down to Antioch, and argued that the Law had been overthrown, and acquiescence in anything of that sort was unthinkable; and they went on to the Galatian churches, and had at any rate some success there.

I venture to think that the Jerusalem Christians had a case, and that it was, roughly speaking, this: when the Jew superimposed his Christianity on to his Judaism, he was adding his Christianity to a whole body of training in which he had been brought up, in which any proselyte had been instructed, with which even Cornelius was well acquainted, and of which Paul was depriving his Gentile converts altogether. If Paul threw over the Law as a whole, as a binding code of discipline, what was left? What was to take its place? Because the Law was not only concerned with circumcision and ceremonial; it was also concerned with the foundation of ethics, with the moral basis of life, with the Ten Commandments. To us it is plain enough that nothing was further from St. Paul's thoughts than to leave his converts under the impression that they need not keep the Ten Commandments; but to the Jewish Christians it

might seem that if the Law were thrown over *simpliciter*, very dangerous possibilities might lie ahead.

If one looks at the Corinthian Epistle, or if one reads the history of the Reformation, it is clear that later events did give some justification for the line taken by the Jewish Christians. If the Gospel of St. Paul could be misrepresented, by some of those who supposed themselves to be his followers, as a claim to full exemption from the restrictions of the Law, the result might indeed lead to something like Antinomianism. Paul has to speak very strongly against this perversion of his preaching. And therefore, as I think, what happened at the Council of Jerusalem was that the Jews put forward their case as to the perilous nature of a mere jettisoning of the Law, and that the concession demanded on one side, and freely given on the other, was this. The Jewish Christians, led by James, were enormously impressed with the success of St. Paul's preaching: and always in the Apostolic Age that was the last word. He had brought masses of outsiders into the Messianic Kingdom, and he must not be judged too hardly for his methods. Only would he not offer assurances to meet certain scruples? So James—who expressly dissociated himself from the action of "some of us" in upsetting the minds of Gentile Christians—agreed for his own part that no attempt should be made to impose the burden of the ceremonial law on any but Jews, provided that it was recognized that the supersession of the ceremonial law did not affect the binding force on Gentiles of the moral law. St. Paul was, of course, abundantly willing to do that; only I think we must realize that when in his Epistles he wanted to tell the Gentile Christians that the ceremonial law was not binding on them, but that the moral law was, and that the Old Testament had a real meaning for Christians, he did experience some embarrassment. When he was inculcating on the Corinthian Christians that the Old Testament had still a supreme and permanent value, not only to the Jew but to the Christian, I do not think he found the process of the argument quite easy: or, perhaps I should rather put it, he would not have found it easy save for his free use of allegory. However, easy or no, his position from the first was that he did whole-heartedly accept the Old Testament, though at the same time he absolutely refused to lay its ceremonial burdens on his Gentile converts.

Now we come to the more minute consideration of the Apostolic Decree. Let me avoid any assumptions as to the value of this or that type of textual evidence. I shall not approach the subject either from the point of view of a supporter, or from the point of view of an opponent, of the Western text.

The problem is this: there are three passages (xv. 20, xv. 28, and xxi. 25) in which the conditions indicated by James and his followers in return for their admission of Gentile freedom from the ceremonial law are mentioned: two in the account of the Council, and one much later on by St. James. In all those three passages there is a fundamental difference between the witnesses to the text that are called Western, and those that are represented by the critical editions and by the *textus receptus*: the latter group names four conditions, the other only three. If you have four, they are: "things sacrificed to idols, blood, things strangled, and fornication." If you have only three, the reference to "things strangled" is omitted. But that is not all. In the Western text, in the text which has only three regulations and omits "things strangled," there is also contained (in the majority of the witnesses) the negative form of the Golden Rule: "to abstain from things sacrificed to idols, from blood, from fornication, and whatsoever things you do not wish done to yourself, do not do to others."*

If we take the reading of the critical texts and insert "things strangled," then I find it extraordinarily difficult to see how to give any intelligent meaning both to this and to "fornication" in the same sentence. One is a purely ritual question; the other is a definite transition to a fundamental question of morals. It is really much as though you supposed the Decree to say: Always wash your hands before dinner, and do not run away with the spoons and forks It is preposterous, as it seems to me, to suppose that the Jewish Christians had no better line of argument than that, to suppose that anyone would have listened to them for a moment if they had professed to settle this profound problem about the universal and permanent validity of the Law with that sort of mixture of stipulations. What happened, as I suppose, is that the Jewish Christians, James and his friends, did want to be reassured by Paul, that when he talked about faith in Christ as the one thing necessary, when he said circumcision, Sabbath and meats matter nothing at all—they did want to be reassured that when he thus threw over the ceremonial law, he was not throwing over the moral law as well. I do not think they suspected him for a moment of excusing immorality or anything of that sort; but

* It is possible to say that the Western text is right, up to a certain point, in the omission of the "things strangled," and yet not right in the insertion of a form of the Golden Rule. It is possible even to say that the "Western" authorities give the right text, but the others give the right interpretation—*i.e.*, that "blood" is correctly glossed by "things strangled." But I myself think that it is just a big question one way or the other: that if you have the Western text and omit "things strangled," the regulations are moral; but that if you adopt the ordinary text and admit "things strangled," the regulations are ceremonial.

I do think they wondered whether he had enough basis of ethical discipline for his teaching to converts from Paganism.

I find, then, in the ordinary text a very serious difficulty of interpretation, by the side of which the criticisms of the "moral" explanation of "blood" in the sense of "bloodshed", and of "things sacrificed to idols" in the sense of "idolatry", seem to me to come to very little.

(1) It is said that *αἷμα* ("blood") cannot mean bloodshed; that it cannot refer in effect to the sixth Commandment. But the word is used in that sense in classical authors at the one end;* and at the other end Moulton and Milligan† tell us that it is used in the sense of "murder" in the Pontic dialect of modern Greek, which I understand is the direct descendant of the Eastern branch of the *κοινή*, the vernacular Greek of the Apostolic Age.

(2) It is said again that we know from the First Epistle to Corinth that there was an actual difficulty felt by the more scrupulous Christians about *idolothyta*: when they dined with heathen friends, they had no security that the meat set before them was not in fact that of animals which had been in the first instance used for pagan sacrifices, and afterwards disposed of in the market to any ordinary buyer. What the more scrupulous felt at Corinth was, it is urged, exactly what the Jewish Christians of Jerusalem felt and wanted to guard against in the Apostolic Decree. But this was not the only meaning of *idolothyta*, and to any Jew familiar with the religious history of his people not the most obvious meaning. In the persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes—the classic instance of persecution of Jews for their religion—the choice between faithfulness and apostasy lay in the eating or refusing of meats that had been sacrificed to idols.‡ Even more striking, because it combines both the two elements *φαγεῖν εἰδωλόθυτα* and *πορνεῦσαι*, is the double reference in Apoc. ii. 14, 20 to the story of Balaam in Num. xxv. 1-3, xxxi. 15, 16, where the "apostasy" takes the double form of partaking of the meats offered in sacrifice to idols and of fornication with the daughters of Moab. I cannot for my own part doubt that what the Jewish Christians at Jerusalem wanted to guard against was a real and definite connivance with idolatry, such as would be implied by conscious participation in idol sacrifices.§ I have no hesitation in interpreting

* So in the tragedians: and in Demosthenes we have such a phrase as *ἐφ' αἵματι φεύγειν* ("to avoid trial for murder by going into exile").

† *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament*, i., p. 13*a*.

‡ See 2 *Maccabees*, chaps. vi. and vii.: especially vi. 21, *ἐσθίοντα τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ βασιλέως τεταγμένα τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς θυσίας κρεῶν*.

§ Note that on the first enumeration of the stipulations (Acts xv. 20) the phrase is not *εἰδωλοθύτων* but *τῶν ἀλισγημάτων τῶν εἰδώλων*, a more sweeping phrase which surely suggests some conscious intention.

"the defilements of idols and blood and fornication" as a summary way of expressing the principal implications of the two halves of the Decalogue, the moral law in its most elementary form.

The first part, then, of my thesis is that the Jewish-Christian position, as expressed in the Apostolic Decree regarded as a summary of the moral law of the Decalogue, follows naturally from the premisses of the case as these are given in the early chapters of the Acts, and embodies a reasonable criticism of any sweeping claim for the exemption of Gentile Christians from "the Law." The second part of my thesis, which on the present occasion I can only adumbrate, is that this Jewish-Christian position, summarized in the Apostolic Decree, is in effect exactly what we find in the so-called Apostolic Church Orders.

What are the distinctive features of Jewish as opposed to Pauline and Gentile Christianity? There are three, and every one of the three it seems to me to be vital to bear in mind. In the first place, Pauline Christianity had a much more advanced Christology, even in the admitted Epistles, 1 and 2 Corinthians and Romans, whereas Jewish Christianity tended to lay more stress on ethics than on Christology. That is the first distinction. Secondly, Gentile Christianity claimed predominantly to go back to Paul, and to Peter and Paul, whereas Jewish Christianity looked back to the Twelve as the authorities, put Paul in the background, and laid no special stress on Peter. That is the second point. The third is this. Gentile Christianity of the Empire was universal or Catholic, and I do not doubt that with every decade in the first century the proportion of Jewish and Gentile Christians in the big cities of the Empire changed with incredible rapidity. The success of the preaching of the Cross among Gentile Christians was, I think we may say, phenomenal. The nucleus was always Jewish, but very soon it ceased to be more than a mere nucleus. So that in the great cities of the Empire—anywhere outside Palestine—you could nowhere find a predominantly Jewish Church. On the other hand, Jewish Christianity—that Christianity the genesis and history of which we have been engaged in tracing—was, in one corner of the world, in a majority. The Jewish Christians of the Dispersion never established themselves side by side with their Gentile fellow-Christians as rivals, they were just swallowed up; but in Palestine, and the parts close to Palestine, the Jewish Christians still lived on, still survived with all their limitations and all their peculiarities.

Now this Jewish Christianity of Palestine and the neighbourhood has, as I believe, survived in literature in one form and

one only—namely, in the Apostolic Church Orders: that is, in the *Didache*, in the so-called *Apostolic Church Order*, in the *Didascalia Apostolorum*, and (in a much attenuated form) in the *Apostolic Constitutions*, four documents which stand in close relation to one another.*

The first common feature of these four documents that I have enumerated is that they all claim to go back to the Twelve Apostles, and to give in their name instruction in ethics and organization. The second common feature (most marked, no doubt, in the earlier documents of the four) is their full treatment of ethics contrasted with their meagre and inadequate Christology. The third thing which (as I believe) they have in common is Palestinian origin. Of course, the later documents are progressively less and less Jewish. But only in the latest document, and only in the latest stratum even of that, is St. Paul completely reinstated in a position of equality with the other Apostles.

The fuller justification of these statements must be left over to another article.

C. H. TURNER.

REUNION

WE all long for reunion; nothing strong enough can be said to express the evils due to disunion. "Our unhappy divisions" grieve the Holy Ghost more, perhaps, than any other sin. One of the greatest hindrances with which Christianity has to contend in foreign mission work is due to the differences between denominations. It would be a joy to us all if the differences could be swept away, and the Church could be outwardly one. At present she is not; she is hotly divided, involving a very large expenditure of money, if not of lives, with absurdly small visible results.

Nevertheless, the proposals that are being made by men and women deeply imbued by the Spirit of Christ, with great sacrifices and ardent hopes, will be tragically unable to produce unity. The South Indian proposals have produced a great spate of literature, and arguments on both sides continue to be very much the same; but no one, so far as I have noticed, has pointed out that the proposals perpetuate Old Testament ideas.

Three of these were closely connected: (1) The solidarity of the nation; (2) the adoption of this nation as the "chosen

* The "Apostolic Tradition" of Hippolytus stands on an entirely different footing, not simply because it is Western and Roman, but because, unlike all the rest, it makes no sort of claim to emanate from the Twelve Apostles themselves.

people"; (3) the acceptance of this chosen people as an *ecclesia* (see Acts vii. 38), a body pictured ideally as always in God's presence, always engaged in worship—that is to say, they felt themselves to be bound together by a bond that was, at the same time, both internal and external. (The internal unity, it is true, was not very firm after the parties of the Pharisees, the Sadducees, the Herodians, and the Essenes had arisen, and when the Rabbinic Schools of Hillel and Shammai differed among themselves.) They did not feel it inconsistent with it to include Gentiles of varying degrees of submission to the Jewish Law. In the New Testament, on the other hand, the Church is regarded in two aspects:* It is, and always has been, an indivisible unity; it embraced as one "people of God" both Israelites and Christians, the latter being only a section of the whole. At the same time, chiefly after the fall of Jerusalem, it was distinct from, and hostile to, the Israelite body. These two theories are mutually opposed; and it is equally idle now to attempt to reconcile the view of it as a spiritual unity which no differences of opinion on matters of government can disintegrate, and that which sees in it an earthly society. The unity of the Spirit, deep love to God the Three in One, and the worship of Jesus Christ, God who became Man and died on our behalf, we already have. We can all accept, as is done in South India, the Scriptures, the Apostles' and the Nicene Creeds, the Sacraments of Baptism and the Supper of our Lord, and the Ministry as a divine gift to the Church. But oneness of belief on other subjects, such as true unity requires, cannot be gained without centuries more of loyalty to the best form of truth that we know; it cannot be gained by man-made schemes, plan we never so wisely. Internal unity will not be furthered by external.

But the need for reunion is so urgent that external unity is thought to be better than nothing, whereas it is really worse. To create it where oneness of belief is lacking is to try (though it is the last thing that the devoted people who make the proposals wish to do) to heal the hurt of God's people lightly, to daub the wall with untempered mortar. Foreigners in India and elsewhere who are thinking people will quickly learn that reunion and unity are far from being identical, and they will be more at a loss than ever.

The proposals that seem to be most likely to bring about reunion are as follows: (1) Episcopal Ordination is to be accepted by all who were ready to accept it before, and by all who wish to take part in the scheme who have not been ordained hitherto.

* See an article by von Dobschütz, *Die Kirche im Urchristentum*, *Z.N.W.*, 1929, pp. 107-118.

(2) An interval, say, of thirty years is to elapse before the new kind of Ordination holds the field, during which it is expected (apart from the probability of a greatly enlarged Ministry during that time) that most of the ministers who have not been episcopally ordained will retire or die; meantime their Ministry, though strictly speaking considered "irregular" as at present, is to be held "valid" in every respect, intrinsically as good as the Ministry of those ordained by Bishops. These two are included in the "Proposed Scheme of Union prepared by the Joint Committee of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon, the South India United Church, and the South India Provincial Synod of the Wesleyan Methodist Church for presentation to the governing bodies of those Churches in India and elsewhere." And that document is naturally behind "The Church Members' Manual of the South India United Church." The uniting bodies "accept in particular the historic episcopate in a constitutional form as part of the basis of union, without intending to imply, or to express a judgment on, any theory concerning Episcopacy" (p. 4)—that is to say, so far as its conferring of anything spiritual is concerned it is considered purely nominal. This is only emphasized in the official report of the United Church, in accordance with corrections made at Madras. As the Archbishop of Dublin wrote, "this agreement on a formula, meaning everything to one side and little or nothing to many upon the other, either masks for momentary convenience a fundamental disagreement, or it is an implied confession that principle is unimportant." (Nothing need be said about the practice, frequent at present, of the interchange of pulpits; it is a mere gesture, as it was doubtless intended to be by many of the Bishops who voted for it at the last Lambeth Conference, to show how real and widespread the desire for reunion is.) If I were a Nonconformist minister I should say, as practically all that have expressed themselves do say: "I do not really believe that any Ministry becomes more valid by the reception of episcopal ordination—an opinion held also by a large number of Anglican clergymen. If it is valid without it for thirty years, it is valid without it always; no one need accept it at all. If any minister of the Free Churches does so, at great self-sacrifice, for the sake of reunion, he will still disagree profoundly with those who hold that a Ministry is somehow more valid because of it." The majority of Nonconformists, although many of them are willing enough for reunion with each other, do not, in their heart of hearts, want reunion with an episcopal body, even as at present proposed. On the other hand, failure to compass it is likely (in South India at any rate) to result in a large schism.

The object of this paper is not to discuss the value of Episcopacy, or to express a judgment on any theory concerning it, but to utter the warning that the present proposals for reunion can do little more than touch the outside surface of things, and will not "shake non-essentials" (as Bishop Brent put it) "into the background, and bring fundamentals to the fore." To use words quoted by the Bishop, "The spice of life lies in its antagonisms"; to which may be added the saying of our Lord: "If the salt have lost its savour, wherewith shall it be salted?" The danger is that for antagonisms will be substituted, through fear of schism, something insipid and useless. There are two states of mind which cannot, with the present proposals, be reconciled. On the one hand, for instance, the Rev. G. A. Bienemann said, in an article in the *Church of Ireland Gazette* this summer, that the promoters of reunion "are wondering whether the time has not come to try an experiment on a small scale whereby those of various Churches and various nationalities, who long for reunion, may be enabled to stay together long enough to understand each other's point of view, and while they are learning, to worship together. . . . It is suggested, then, that outside the town of Lausanne, but within easy reach, a settlement of a certain number of houses should be built, each house to contain some seven or eight, or possibly more, families, who would live under the same roofs with common rooms and the possibility (but only that) of common meals. An absolute necessity would be a place of common worship." And yet, as the article proceeds, it is made clear that some would not feel at home in such a place: "First, you have a room: the Christian Church began as a family in an Upper Room; and there are many, to this day, who worship best in an upper room, where the great act of worship can, with difficulty, be distinguished outwardly from the ordinary family meal. . . . But by the side of this room there is a little chapel. There is an altar. Here the Holy Eucharist is celebrated regularly by Old Catholic priests, and from time to time by High Church Lutherans and Anglicans. . . . There is a partition between the room and the chapel; the door is never shut, and the windows are always open, and prayer and praise can be heard by all."

On the other hand, those of very different views agree that true unity can be only inward and spiritual. Thus the Rev. H. L. Pass is reported to have said in a speech at about the same time: "The highest forms of unity known to us in experience are forms of unity containing within themselves differentiations." After giving as instances the solidarity of humanity, and of such lesser unities as societies or corporations, he went on to say:

"That which is most characteristic of the Christian idea of God . . . claims for God Himself this very differentiated unity, a distinction without separation of the three Sacred Persons of the Most Holy Trinity." And he believed that the succession of Bishops from the Apostles is a "fundamental" idea, "not evolved from below, but devolved from above." If so, it would be useless to water down this doctrine; it would bring about neither reunion on the one hand, nor order on the other. At the opposite end of the Church there is the same thing. In his presidential address in July, Dr. Lofthouse told the Wesleyan Conference (no doubt expressing the feelings of all present) that 'if the Church is ever to be one, she must be evangelical and not sacerdotal." The meaning of the two adjectives need not here be discussed; it is the Wesleyan attitude to reunion that is now of importance. And Dr. J. D. Jones, formerly a President of the Congregational Union, pointed out in the *Christian World* the great difficulties* of the scheme from his party's point of view, maintaining that union by means of Episcopacy is not the same as the unity of the Spirit. The Conference at Lausanne declared in a report: "It is stated that the Church on earth possesses certain characteristics by which it can be known of men," one of which is a "ministry of the pastoral office," which includes alike "preaching of the Word and administration of the Sacraments"; but it appended a note in which, as Mr. Pass put it, "we are told that in the Providence of God a particular form has been shown to be necessary for the best welfare of the Church, others say that no form of ministry is inherently preferable, still others that no organization is necessary." And he added: "Could divergence on so central a point be greater?"†

If reunion is simply unity of action, brought about by an aggregate of more or less like-minded congregations, it will be of little value compared with the inner and lasting unity—though far slower to arrive—of these two conditions of mind.‡ (Nothing is here said of reunion with the Roman and Orthodox communions—the larger part of Christendom—to both of which Episcopacy is of enormous importance; reunion with the other "reformed" Churches alone is discussed.) To plead for that which will postpone it to a remote period will be condemned by many as weak and faint-hearted, and opposition to the suggestions for reunion that are now being made will suffer the

* Difficulties are pointed out also by the Rev. Canon Sparrow-Simpson in the *Spectator*, October 26, 1929.

† Among numerous instances the divergence is seen also in the views of Bishop Palmer and Bishop Gore respectively.

‡ And see the article by E. R. Morgan on the South India proposals in THEOLOGY, August, 1929, pp. 66-74.

worse fate of being thought narrow-minded or bigoted. But more harm will be done by working towards a speedy outward reunion at the cost of living unity. That which was outwardly one would soon be divided against itself, and real unity would be postponed indefinitely. However urgent the need for reunion is—and that it is terribly urgent no one who knows anything of missionary work will deny—I feel sure that the present proposals will in the long run do more injury than good to the Church of God.

And two further considerations must not be lost sight of: Firstly, although South India is geographically a long way off, she cannot remain isolated; her decisions will affect the whole Church. And secondly, as the Archbishop of York said, the tide will probably turn in a few years, and the desire for separateness will again come to the front, so that that which is decided now must be safe and permanent.

Canon Streeter, in *The Primitive Church*, offers facts which he very interestingly presents in detail, but which were known in general to the student of Church history long ago. He condemns (p. ix) "the uncriticized assumption, made by all parties to the controversy, that in the first century there existed a single type of Church Order. Approach the evidence (he says) without that assumption, and two conclusions come into sight: (1) In the New Testament itself there can be traced an evolution in Church Order, comparable to the development in theological reflection detected by the scholarship of the last century. (2) The most natural interpretation of the other evidence is that, at the end of the first century A.D., there existed, in different provinces of the Roman Empire, different systems of Church government. Among these, the Episcopalian, the Presbyterian, and the Independent can each discover the prototype of the system to which he himself adheres." In some Churches (as of course he shows) the Episcopalian prototype is found at an early date: "At Jerusalem a monarchical episcopate was primitive; in the larger Churches of Asia . . . it was established before Ignatius wrote." Ignatius speaks of it so often and so vehemently in his letters just before his martyrdom, that it had evidently become (Dr. Streeter thinks) an obsession with him, and that he was striving with great difficulty to introduce it in his own Church of Antioch. At any rate, the entrusting of the monarchical authority to the Bishop took place there, though it was apparently later in doing so than some other towns. And Ignatius is thought to have interpreted Clement's letter to the Corinthians "as if non-episcopacy" (as Dr. Streeter often calls it) "had been immemorial at Rome" (p. 177), whereas the Church government there was rather "of a type which may

not inappropriately be called 'Presbyterian'" (p. 221). Dr. Streeter's work on the early Christian literature need not here be discussed;* but its bearing on reunion is open to serious question. The closing words are: "In the Primitive Church no one system of Church Order prevailed. Everywhere there was readiness to experiment, and, where circumstances seemed to demand it, to change. . . . It is permissible to hint that the first Christians achieved what they did, because the spirit with which they were inspired was one favourable to experiment. In this—and, perhaps, in some other respects—it may be that the line of advance for the Church of today is not to imitate the forms, but to recapture the spirit, of the Primitive Church" (p. 262). In other words, Dr. Streeter desires a "readiness to experiment" now.

But it is well known that "Apostolical Succession" is no longer understood, by most students of Church history, to mean that the Apostles appointed persons *to be monarchical Bishops*. As long ago as 1868 Lightfoot† freely recognized—the fact being further illuminated by Professor Turner‡—that monarchical Episcopacy was not established universally at once; some places took a longer, and some a shorter, time before they adopted it; some seem to have been content for a while with the supremacy of those—many of them not apostles at all—who possessed the special gifts which marked them out as prophets. But all alike arrived, sooner or later, and many soon, at the same conclusion. "Christendom," says Lightfoot, "had hitherto existed as a number of distinct isolated congregations, drawn in the same direction by a common faith and common sympathies, accidentally linked one with another by the personal link and apostolic authority of their common teachers, but not bound together in a harmonious whole by any permanent organization." But never was the attempt made, as it is now, to put the clock back. *The Primitive Church*, though it studies the brief period before the congregations were bound together, is far from explaining why the attempt should be made to recapture its spirit. The first Christians achieved what they did because they were filled with the Divine Spirit, "something as definite and observable as, for example, an attack of influenza" (p. 69), not because "the spirit with which they were inspired was one favourable to experiment." If any of them thought of experimenting, they came quickly and unanimously to the same conclusion, as has been said. If the arguments of *The Primitive Church* had been put before a writer of that date, he

* See a review by K. E. Kirk in THEOLOGY, November, 1929, pp. 291-295.

† Dissertation on *The Christian Ministry in Philippians*.

‡ *The Early History of the Church and the Ministry* (ed. Swete, 2nd edition, Brightman).

might have been brought to admit that there was a period after the Apostles—longer or shorter in different cases—in which the monarchical espiscopate had not begun; but he would not have advocated the recapture of its spirit. Even he could perhaps have understood—and certainly we can understand—that the forms of Church government differed at that time because the Church was crude, inchoate, undeveloped. Today it is rent for a different reason; it is because Nonconformists disapproved of the presence, or more often the absence, of certain characteristics in it when their separate bodies came in consequence into being. Reunion must be one of heart and motive, and Ordination by Bishops will not produce it. We ought, it is very true, to be "striving zealously to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace"; but the bond is to be forged not by outward organization, but "with all lowliness and meekness, forbearing one another in love."

A. H. McNeile.

SOME LETTERS ON MISSIONS IN INDIA

The early history of missionary work in India by the Church of England is full of interest, and the interest grows as the nineteenth century begins. The subject is familiar to all who have read two notable studies: J. W. Kaye's *Christianity in India: an Historical Narrative* (1859), and Sir James Stephen's *Essays on Ecclesiastical Biography*. In the religious history of that time the noble names of Shore and Grant and Thornton and Wilberforce will never be forgotten. From 1808, when Claudius Buchanan published his *Memoirs on an Indian Church Establishment*, the matter was not allowed to rest. The Bible Society and the Church Missionary Society kept it alive, assisted by a number of pamphlets which even the kindest critic cannot deny to be extremely ponderous. But the ultimate decision of the many questions which were raised lay in the hands of the East India Company and the Board of Control. I have recently become possessed of certain documents which emanated from each of these authorities, and I think that some extracts from them will be found to be of interest today. It will be remembered that the most influential members of the East India Company in 1807 and 1808, the period to which these documents belong, were Edward Parry and Charles Grant, and that the President of the Board of Control was the redoubtable Robert Dundas, the first Lord Melville.

The subject of Christian missions became a "burning" one

after the mutiny at Vellore (1806), which was quite erroneously (for any stick will do to beat a missionary with) supposed to be caused, at least partly, by attempts to convert the Madras Sepoys to Christianity. The accusation was conclusively disproved, but it was not quite dislodged from the mind of Dundas, and it rankled in the hearts of the East India Directors. On June 8, 1807, Edward Parry and Charles Grant addressed an extremely long letter to Dundas. They began with a general statement.

> The subject of permitting Christian Missionaries to exercise their functions in British India, on which you have . . . been pleased to state some observations and propositions, is one which we deem to be of considerable importance, not only in respect to the grand object which is professedly the end of Missionary labours, namely, the conversion of Heathens and Idolaters to the pure Religion of Christ, but as the toleration of those labours may be supposed to bear upon the political interests of the Company in India, and the prohibition of them may consist with the spirit of the Gospel, and may affect public opinion and the credit of the Company in this country.

This they followed by a complete vindication of the missionaries from any concern in the mutiny, and a plain statement of the simple course pursued by those in Bengal. The critics, they were sure, wrote not from practical experience, but from an erroneous theory.

> For with regard to the jealousy which is supposed, a very false idea is conveyed by the language now used; which would imply that the exhibition of the Doctrines of Christianity among the Natives was of itself sufficient to alarm them, whereas *all experience* and the History of India for several past Centuries will attest that Christian Missionaries, popish and protestant, have proposed their tenets and made converts there without exciting any sentiment of alarm in the minds of the People, who have been accustomed for many Ages to see a great diversity of Religions among them. It is only of a *Christian Government* tolerating Christian Missionaries that jealousy on the part of the Natives can with any colour of reason be supposed; and to advert briefly to this topic,—Where the Government has really no design and employs no authority to impose its Religion, this jealousy, having no aliment to support it, must die; as it can only be brought into a short existence by such a combination of folly on the side of our Government, and wickedness on the part of our enemies, as lately appeared on the Coast. But let it be observed that to such slanderous imputations as were recently propagated by the Mahomedans of Vellore and Hyderabad, a Government of a Faith different from the Religions of its Subjects will always be liable, nor can the possibility of imputation here be obviated, except by an identity of faith among the Governors and the Governed. But even a conformity to the Religion of the People, if we could be so lost as to adopt this base principle, could not in a Country abounding with Mahomedans as well as Hindoos be followed up to the complete attainment of its object. And as it is not by shewing indifference to our own Religion that we shall recommend

ourselves to the Natives, so it is not by interposing our authority now to suppress the quiet pacific attempts hitherto used by Individuals to promulgate the truths of Christianity in India, that we shall promote in the people of that Country a spirit of contentment and obedience. By the discovery of our fear they would be encouraged to presume upon it. General toleration, the principle of a wise Government, protecting all Sects, proscribing none, will be our surest rule.

On this follows a very sharp criticism of the way in which many "Europeans familiarized to India" regard Christianity and Hinduism, neglecting (often of necessity) the ordinances of the former and ignoring the fact that the latter is "*in practice* one of the most gross and cruel superstitions on earth."

An interesting passage follows which contrasts the conduct of Wellesley with that of those who succeeded him.

For a few months, as we are well informed, after the departure of Marquis Wellesley who had the merit of publicly respecting the Ordinances of Christianity and countenancing the Teachers of it, whether Chaplains or Missionaries, and who appears to have thought it would be wise policy to extend the knowledge of it among our Native Subjects, the Magistrates in some of the Districts in which the Missionaries went to itinerate stoped [*sic*] them, and would not let them proceed without Passports, which the Government though professing goodwill to these objects, respect to their Persons, and alleging no fault against them, refused, perhaps on the suggestion of some of its subordinate officers.

There seem to the writers to be but two objections to the conversion of the natives of India: that "the attempt may produce a convulsion," and that success would render the natives less submissive to British rule. Both are dismissed as having no reasonable ground, and the argument is concluded by a "point of high importance":

"that the one grand *desideratum* necessary to the consolidation of our Indian Empire, Religion, and Religion only will supply, namely, a *common principle or bond of union between the Governors and the Governed.* In every thing which usually unites the Rulers and the Subjects of a State, as identity of Descent, of Country, Language, Education, Religion, Laws, Manners and Character, we and the Indian People whom we govern, are totally dissimilar. History hardly furnishes any example of a durable State thus constituted, unless where the Conquerors colonized and infused a large portion of their own Race among the People they subdued. The Greek and Roman Conquests, those of the Moguls, the Tartars in China, and the Spaniards in America, will all illustrate this position.

In history, laws, education, English and Indians are utterly unlike: only in religion can a bond of union be found. The references to Carey are most interesting.

Turning then to charges against the missionaries in Bengal, Parry and Grant observed the measures of repression exercised

in regard to them by the magistrates in Calcutta, and declared that all of them were exemplary in their lives and the principal men among them learned especially in the Oriental languages, as shown by the appointments made by Lord Wellesley in his college—Carey and Marshman being especially notable.

Must Christian missions be checked—they have never been encouraged—by the Company? At the last renewal of the charter (1793) the House of Commons had resolved that it was a duty to adopt such measures as would gradually lead to the religious and moral improvement of the inhabitants of British India. It is inconsistent to preserve the large endowments of Hinduism and prohibit the diffusion of Christianity.

The rest of the letter, which is an answer to one from Dundas, is concerned with political matters.

On July 9, 1808, Parry and Grant wrote a letter to Dundas pointing out that there was a great body of public opinion in England which would certainly oppose the renewal of the Company's charter (which was due in 1813) if they "believed the Company to be hostile to the principle of introducing Christianity into India." In this short and temperate letter they laid stress on the wisdom with which Christian preaching should be favoured, and distinctly opposed the restrictive measures which had been issued, in what would across the Atlantic be termed a panicky way, by the Government of India. They enclosed the draft of a despatch to the Governor-General in Council, which it was proposed to send out, a careful, precise, not wholly unsympathetic rebuke and instruction. It is clear that Dundas rather sharply amended this, and no doubt wisely amended it, by considerable excision. As the final form is printed by Kaye in an appendix (p. 517 *sqq.*), there is no need to reproduce even the last paragraph, which presents in its best light the reasoned educational policy of the East India Company. The draft was much more emphatic and more detailed in its assertion of the freedom of missionaries to preach and to teach children.

The letter is endorsed as concerned with the "Protestant missionaries established in the Danish settlement of Serampore." Its date is July 9. A copy of the minutes of the secret court shows that the subject was considered on July 21, especially in regard to the proceedings on the Bengal Government: again on August 4, when the consideration was adjourned to August 11. Then the court was stirred up by a letter from Dundas. On August 16 a draft was produced and amended.

With this clearly Parry and Grant were not satisfied. On August 16, 1808, from the East India House "the Chairman and Deputy Chairman* present their compliments to Mr. Dundas,

* Edward Parry and Charles Grant.

and have the honour to transmit for his perusal, copy of a minute which they have this day recorded on the Secret Proceedings of the Court of Directors." This explained why they had signed a despatch sent on behalf of the Court of Directors, but now thought it necessary to explain their own private sentiments in detail. The significant parts of the minute follow:

1. Whilst we sincerely and decidedly maintain the necessity of all due prudence and caution in every attempt to make known the Christian Religion to the Natives of India, we cannot but think that on such an occasion as the present when the Court are laying down Opinions and Rules on this subject, it is indispensable to recognize as a principle that it is the duty of this Christian Country as well in obedience to the dictates of its Religion as from regard to the welfare of its heathen Subjects, to endeavor by prudent and proper methods to communicate the light of the Gospel to them. We do not mean to say that it is the duty of the Company's Government or of any other Government, to employ the least authority or influence in this work; but that the Nation and the Company as a part of it should be desirous to promote the prudent and safe exertions of Individuals, of proper character, in the diffusion of the knowledge of Christianity in India. The acknowledgement of such a principle does by no means imply or require that all political considerations should in consequence of it be disregarded. The argument for Religion should not exclude the consideration of political consequences, nor the plea of political consequences exclude the consideration of Religion; and we think that a disposition to give them both their due place may bring them to write at a safe point. The want of a distinct and full recognition therefore of this principle without which some of the admissions in the Letter respecting Christianity appear cold and far below the terms suitable in speaking of so great a blessing, is our first and greatest Objection to the Letter.

2. We are of opinion that our Indian Government ought to exercise a superintendence and control over the conduct of Missionaries employed in our Territories, but that they ought to use their power impartially neither conniving at real danger, nor groundlessly advancing the plea of it to crush the labours of Missionaries. We mean not to charge the Bengal Government with either of these extremes, but to state that the Letter does not sufficiently guard against the last. Some passages in it are so expressed that if but one or two Natives should (from any motive, either the impulse of those adverse to the whole idea of extending Christianity to India or from personal enmity) pretend alarm for their Religion, those passages might afford a sufficient pretext to the Government to suppress all Missionary exertions. And without at all supposing any such disposition on the part of the Government abroad, or any design to countenance it at home, yet if from the tenor of the Court's instructions to India, it were to be conceived there that the Court were unconcerned about the general object and ready to abandon it on the first plea of political danger, such pleas and complaints to that effect on the part of Individuals, would probably not be wanting.

3. We wish by no means to confound the case or the fate of the present Missionaries in Bengal with the general question of tolerating endeavors to propagate Christianity in India; it is for the last we are most solicitous,

but we conceive that this question may be affected by any appearance of unnecessary severity to the present Missionaries. And as we think that in some parts of the proceedings towards those Missionaries, Government went beyond what its professed Objects required, and unnecessarily committed itself, we could have wished the Letter had touched explicitly on those points, but on this head it is not our purpose to enlarge.

The minutes of the court say that "the Chairman and Deputy delivered in a Paper containing their Observations on the beforementioned Draft which was read."

A further note of Dundas concludes the documents in my possession. It runs thus:

SECRET

Mr D. presents his Compliments to the Ch. & Ds. Ch. of the E.I.C. and has the honor to acquaint them that it is his intention to propose to the Com^{n} for the Affairs of India an addition to the Draft No. 167 in reply to a letter recently received from the Governor General in Council dated the 7th December 1807.

Addressed to the Secret Committee.

DON^{a} STREET,
18*th Aug^{t}*, 1808.

PROPOSED ADDITION TO DRAFT No. 167
22ND AUGUST 1808

Since the preceding paragraphs were written your letter of the 7th December 1807 to the Select Committee has been received, together with copies of the letter and memorial addressed to the Governor General by the Revd Dr Claudius Buchanan.

We desire to express our entire satisfaction at the explanation which you have thought it necessary to give of your proceedings, and as most of the observations which would naturally have occurred to us on the perusal of those documents have already been stated in this letter, we deem it unnecessary to enlarge further on the subject.

With every disposition to make due allowance in favor of ardent zeal in the cause of Religion, it would have been impossible for us to avoid noticing the improper stile of Dr Buchanan's address to the Supreme Authority in India, if his subsequent departure from thence had not in some degree relieved us from that necessity. We shall content ourselves at present with remarking that Dr Buchanan, as well as all other Ecclesiastics who promulgate the doctrines of Christianity in India and who bestow such just and merited encomiums on the conduct of the Missionary Schwartz, would do well to adopt it as the model of their own, and would always recollect that discretion and moderation in their langague and actions are most consistent with the mild spirit of our Religion, and are *indispensably requisite for those who are employed in prosecuting the laborious work of conversion.*

What shall we now say about these documents, often precise and pedantic, but representing the honest feelings of their age

* This is written on the margin, as a correction of what Dundas had originally put down. The memorandum is holograph, but unsigned.

so characteristically? First, I think that there is very little difference between them and official opinions today. A very clear line of official non-intervention has always been drawn by the Government of British India, whether Company or Crown. Its best, most honourable expression can be found in Queen Victoria's proclamation after the Mutiny.

But there have often been officials in whom this policy was expressed by a somewhat bullying attitude towards missionaries with an absence (such as General Smuts seems to have shown lately) of understanding.

It will be well briefly to summarize the proceedings to which all these letters refer. We have not only Kaye's invaluable *Christianity in India* (1859), but now a new and interesting volume by Arthur Mayhew, C.I.E., on *Christianity and the Government of India: an Examination of the Christian Forces at Work in the Administration of India and of the Mutual Relations of the British Government and Christian Missions*, 1600 *to* 1920. In this is sketched the work of Carey: and in Professor Coupland's admirable book on William Wilberforce there is a similar eulogy. With him, says Mr. Mayhew, begins a new era in the relations of Christian missions to the Indian Government. It is this which is shown in the letters I have quoted. Schwartz, the Danish missionary in the south, to whom there is such a noble contemporary tribute in Colonel Wilks's *Historical Sketches of South India*, had managed to win the confidence of the English authorities; but Carey, and his companion Thomas, came without a licence, and there were many signs in their conduct which could only be regarded as "seeking for trouble." Wellesley, whose character Mr. P. E. Roberts has done so much lately to vindicate, felt bound to complain to the Danes who housed these devout and impetuous enthusiasts. "Would his Excellency the Governor of Serampore see to the expulsion of these interlopers, who might at any moment violate the territories of the British East India Company?" Rash Englishmen, sheltered by foreigners, disgusted their countrymen at Calcutta. The merchants were a timid company. The Black Hole was not forgotten. But the missionaries at Serampore, who were Anabaptists by sect, were not deterred. They translated the Bible into Bengali, and sent a copy with some difficulty to George III., who with his usual sound good sense expressed his gratification.

Then there was Wellesley's great creation of the college at Fort William, and Claudius Buchanan, a chaplain of the Company, became its provost, and Carey the ex-cobbler, who had an extraordinary genius for languages, became a professor. Carey was a man of power as remarkable as Bunyan, his "co-religion-

ist": he paid no more heed to Government ban than did his converts to Hindu persecution. His press produced tracts in seventeen languages, and so long as Wellesley remained in India he remained undisturbed at his post. Sir George Hilaro Barlow, the next Governor-General, saw less clearly the value and the virtues of missionaries; while Lord Minto was even more alarmed when a Mohammedan convert to Christianity, in a tract from the mission press, called Mohammed an impostor and actually asked Carey if he did not think it wrong to attempt to make Indians Christians. Thus there came a period, as Mr. Mayhew says, of partial restriction of Christian propaganda in Bengal.

It was the "mutiny" at Vellore which brought the anti-Christian opposition to a crisis, such as is represented in the letters I have quoted. Christian patience slowly won the day, when it was backed by common sense. The ablest of the Governors repeated and explained his own policy and experience, and so at last the views of Grant and Shore prevailed. "While I was in India I never knew any danger arising from the missionaries' proceedings. They are a quiet, ordered, discreet, and learned body. I thought it my duty to have the ten letters translated into the language of the East. A Christian Governor could not do less than this; a British Governor could not do more." Words worthy of the great Proconsul.

W. H. HUTTON.

CONFIRMATION AND SOUTH INDIA—I.

[SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT.—In the first part of this article an attempted defence by Bishop Palmer of the position assigned to Confirmation in the proposals for union in South India is challenged, and a survey of the practice of the Church in both East and West from the earliest times is held to demonstrate the misleading character of that defence. It is also argued that, even if the Bishop's statement as far as it purports to describe the practice of the Roman Church be allowed to pass, his conclusions are by no means justified. A Catholic cannot safely allow that Confirmation is a thing indifferent.

In the second part a statement by Dr. N. P. Williams is criticized as leading logically to the Nonconformist position as regards Confirmation. This introduces us to the problem of the relation of the grace of Baptism to that of Confirmation. A short survey of ancient and current teaching on this subject forces us to conclude that the real heart of the problem has not hitherto been reached. The origin of the difficulty is found in two passages in the Acts, and a suggestion is offered as to the reason for St. Luke's adoption of that phraseology. The principle that "where the Spirit is, there He is entirely," brings us to the heart of the problem.

In the concluding part of this article we point out that attempts to explain the "gift" of the Spirit at our Lord's Baptism reveal the fact that the problem is not merely one of the relation of the grace of Confirmation to that of Baptism, but that of grace in general to the idea of the indwelling of the Spirit in all things. Our habit of speaking of the "gift" of the Spirit is shown to be misleading, and a new line of thought is indicated which avoids the difficulties. The bearing of this upon the South India proposals is then exhibited. We conclude that, at least as regards Confirmation, those proposals are unacceptable.]

I

THE South Indian Reunion proposals have drawn attention afresh to the Church's use of Confirmation. The fact that, in the Catholic Church, the manner of performing this rite has varied is being made the ground of a proposal that other forms of admission to full Church membership should be recognized in the united Church. Why should we resist this proposal?

The New Testament, as far as we can tell, knows of no admission ceremony except this, together with Baptism, of which this is the completion. We cannot indeed say that no other form of admission except the laying on of an Apostle's hands is really primitive, but we *can* say that we have primitive evidence for no other form.

Now it does not seem to be argued that the rival admission ceremonies have any advantage over Confirmation, except possibly on the ground of convenience. There *are* localities where it is difficult to secure a Bishop's presence at frequent intervals, and so instructed and eager candidates for admission to Holy Communion sometimes endure a trying delay. But this can hardly be the reason why in South India Nonconformists are unwilling to accept Confirmation as the sole rite of admission to communicant status, for the Anglican rubric would allow an instructed and eager candidate for Confirmation to be admitted to Holy Communion without waiting for actual Confirmation. It does seem strange that, after agreeing to accept episcopal ordination as the sole future method of ordination, these Indian Nonconformists should boggle at accepting the laying on of episcopal hands as the sole method of admission to communicant status. It strikes an onlooker as being a straining out of the gnat while swallowing the camel. Is it that there is an idea abroad that Confirmation is not a rite for which the Church of England would fight to the last ditch?

On the Anglican side certain scholars have urged that the sacramental character of Confirmation makes it wrong to equate it with these other admission ceremonies. Bishop Palmer, however, in his defence of the Reunion proposals in the *Church*

Times of last September 20, replies that "you do not *equate* things by saying that one effect of each of them is the same." Quite so. But if one effect of two different things is admitted to be the same, and if that effect is the only practical reason for their use, and you allow that either may be used in order to produce that effect, then for practical purposes you do equate them. Why is not the same line followed about ordination? Why not, while still refusing to admit the equality of other methods of ordination with that of episcopal ordination, allow these other methods to be used side by side with episcopal ordination? It can only be that the Anglican promoters of the scheme see a "necessity" in episcopal ordination which they do not see in Confirmation. In fact, Bishop Palmer handsomely admits this in the article referred to. He says that "the rule which has put Confirmation into the position of the door of access to Communion is only an English Church rule, though some seven hundred years old. It was never the rule in the Roman Church; nor is this connection between Confirmation and Communion made in the Orthodox Church, in which Confirmation is administered with Baptism." He adds: "It has been my practice in all these negotiations to *insist* on nothing which is purely Anglican." All this is formally correct, and yet it is intensely misleading.

To begin with, to stress the point that in the Orthodox Church Confirmation is thought of in connection with Baptism rather than with Communion is to emphasize a distinction without a difference. It still remains true that in the Orthodox Church unconfirmed persons are not (normally, if at all) admitted to Holy Communion. And, in fact, in the Orthodox Church Communion does normally immediately follow Baptism and Confirmation, even in the case of infants, so, although there is no explicit statement of the connection between Confirmation and Holy Communion, there is the practical connection. It is true that in Justin Martyr Communion follows immediately upon Baptism, without any explicit mention of Confirmation. But Justin's reference to Baptism (*Apol.*, I., ch. lxi.) is extremely condensed, and we have no right to assume that Confirmation in his time did not immediately follow Baptism, as it does in St. Cyril of Jerusalem, and still does in the Eastern Church (and in Spain even in the modern Roman Church). There might be some justification for the assumption if it could be shown that in New Testament times Confirmation was not the recognized completion of Baptism, but that is exactly what it is. The story in Acts viii. must be allowed to reflect its light upon all the other New Testament references to Baptism in the Church *unless it can be shown that the action of Philip and the Apostles*

on that occasion was called out only by some peculiar feature of the situation. Apparently Philip had not laid his hands on the Samaritan converts at their baptism. Why not? Either because he knew nothing about this practice, or else because he knew that it was confined to Apostles. There is not sufficient evidence to make it *certain* which was the reason, but the extremely natural way in which the reference to the laying on of the Apostles' hands is introduced makes it difficult to believe that this was a new departure. We admit that we are not expressly told that Peter and John were sent by the Apostles *in order* to lay their hands upon the converts, but this is the natural inference from the narrative, and it is confirmed by Acts xix. 1-7. There, with the same naturalness, we are told that the Apostle Paul completed the baptism of certain Ephesian disciples by laying his hands on them. St. Paul's questions to these Ephesian disciples show that he expected the gift of the Spirit to be bestowed by Christian Baptism, yet after baptizing them he proceeded at once with the laying on of hands, which proves that by Baptism he meant not only the washing, but also the imposition of hands. While we admit, then, that in the New Testament Christian Baptism is not in every case *certainly* completed by the imposition of hands, it certainly sometimes was, and there is nothing to show that it was not always so completed. We can understand the absence of references to Confirmation if it was regarded as included in Baptism, but we cannot understand why it should be mentioned in a few cases if it was not so included.

But we are told that it was never the rule in the Roman Church to regard Confirmation as a door of access to Communion. This seems to be intended to suggest that Rome normally admits to Communion the unconfirmed as well as the confirmed, and has always done so. Unless this is intended, the statement has no bearing upon the South Indian proposals. But has Rome taken this line about Confirmation? It is true that Rome has no rubric like the one at the end of our Confirmation Service, but it does not follow that Rome now or previously regarded or regards Confirmation as a thing "indifferent." In the earliest times in the West, as in the East, Confirmation normally immediately followed upon Baptism. It follows that in the East and the West Confirmation was normally regarded as a necessary prerequisite for communicant status. In the West, too, as still in the East, both Baptism and Confirmation were regularly administered to infants. Did the Western Church continue to give Communion to infants after it had postponed their Confirmation? Let us see what the probabilities are.

The separation of Confirmation from Baptism was begun in the West as early as the third century, but for many centuries the interval between the two rites was not very wide. It was minimized by making Easter and Whitsuntide the normal seasons for administering Baptism, or even by postponing Baptism for a few years. As late as the thirteenth century in England synods at Worcester (1240) and Chichester (1246) regarded a year's interval as the maximum, though later in the same century an interval of three years was tolerated by a synod held at Exeter, and of seven years by a synod held at Durham (*cf.* *Confirmation* [S.P.C.K.] vol. i., p. 52).*

In the same way the abandonment of Infant Communion in the West was gradual. The writer of the article on the "Communion of Children" in the *Catholic Encyclopædia* asserts that in the West the practice of Infant Communion "was restricted to the occasions of Baptism and dangerous illness," but the only passage he cites (St. Cyprian, *Lib. De Lapsis*, ch. xxv.) mentions no such restriction. Hedley, late Roman Catholic Bishop of Newport, in his well-known work on *The Holy Eucharist*, says quite plainly that "up to about the twelfth century [in the West] it was the custom to give the Holy Communion to young children" (p. 87); and again: "The custom of communicating infants began to give way in the eleventh century, and by the thirteenth it had almost completely ceased" (p. 88). Thus the gradual abandonment of Infant Communion was concurrent with the gradual widening of the interval between Baptism and Confirmation. During the centuries when Infant Communion was practised there was only a short interval between Baptism and Confirmation, and so, except for the comparatively rare instances of the somewhat superstitious practice of communicating newly-born *unbaptized* infants,† upon which it would be clearly improper to base a modern usage, there seems to be no evidence or probability at all that unconfirmed persons were admitted to Communion. The later exceptions mentioned in *Confirmation* (vol. i., pp. 58-59) would clearly come within the Anglican rubric. In this connection it is important to note that, although Rome teaches that Baptism is universally necessary to salvation, both *necessitate medii* and *necessitate præcepti*, she refuses to admit a like necessity as regards Holy Communion. The Council of Trent, in discouraging (but not forbidding) the practice of Infant Communion, "teaches that little children who have not attained the use of reason are not by any necessity bound to the sacramental Communion of the Eucharist" (Session xxi., can. 4). As

* Did the size of the diocese have anything to do with this variation?

† See Hedley, *op. cit.*, pp. 87-88.

regards those who are no longer children, Morrisroe (article "Holy Communion" in the *Catholic Encyclopædia*) says that "the doctrine of the Church is that Holy Communion is morally necessary for salvation," but Hedley (*op. cit.*, p. 129) is far less insistent. He says: "The Holy Eucharist, wonderful gift of God as it is, is not held by the Catholic Church to be a Sacrament which is absolutely necessary for salvation. That is, absolutely speaking, the soul of man can attain the Beatific Vision even if the Blessed Sacrament has never been received during mortal life. All that is needed for admission to the bliss of Heaven is the sanctifying grace of our most holy Redeemer; and this can be conferred by Baptism, by the Sacrament of Penance, or even under certain circumstances by acts of contrition alone. The Fathers, especially St. Augustine, speak of Baptism as supposing a desire to receive the Holy Eucharist. That Sacrament is, no doubt, in the traditional Catholic view, the natural means of increasing and perfecting that spiritual life which begins by Baptism. But the spiritual life itself is not absolutely dependent upon it." Although Hedley adds that "at the same time it is the indisputable teaching of the Church that, *for those who have come to the use of reason* [our italics], the participation of the Holy Eucharist is a divine precept. . . . Any man who voluntarily abstained from it altogether would certainly, as a fact, fall into mortal sin" (pp. 129-130), he further allows that "the divine precept of Holy Communion, although it binds every man, evidently does not bind all in the same degree. Its urgency will depend on many circumstances: on a man's disposition, surroundings and temptations, and on the character of the times in which he lives" (p. 130). In view of this teaching, we see that there would be no *doctrinal* grounds for pressing Communion on the unconfirmed. Moreover, the centuries during which the practice of postponing Confirmation to the years of discretion was growing up were precisely the centuries during which the practice of frequent Communion was rapidly falling into decay. The confirmed faithful communicated so infrequently that in 1215 the Fourth Lateran Council had to enjoin that the faithful should communicate at least once a year. Once more we see that the probability is all against the admission of the unconfirmed to Communion. Bishop Palmer's attempt to treat as a purely English rule the insistence upon Confirmation as the door to communicant status, with the corollary that it can safely be set aside, is therefore misleading. So is his further remark that the rule is only seven hundred years old. There is nothing to show that Archbishop Peckham's rule (1281), which found its way into the Sarum Manual and thence into our English Prayer Book, was an

innovation. Canons were frequently made to rescue ancient practices from threatened disuse, and this may have been such a rule. Dr. Maclean (*Confirmation*, vol. i., p. 58) says that this canon "shows that the practice was otherwise," but this is gratuitous, and would lead to some strange conclusions if applied to canons in general.

But even if it were proved that baptized but unconfirmed persons were commonly admitted to Communion, it would not be proved that Roman practice falls outside the scope of the Anglican rubric, especially if Baptism was regarded as implying or supposing a desire to receive Communion. In any case, Bishop Palmer's attempt to use the supposed Roman view of Confirmation in support of the proposal in the South Indian scheme to make Confirmation only one of several recognized methods of admission to communicant status would only be justified if Rome admitted to Communion those who *refused* to be confirmed. We may add that even if the Roman view of Confirmation is what Bishop Palmer represents it to be, this would be but another Roman declension from primitive Catholic practice. It would be somewhat odd if the union of Protestants with Anglicans were accompanied and partly secured by the adoption of a Roman error! We assert, therefore, that the appeal to Greek and Roman ideas about Confirmation, so far from supporting, as Bishop Palmer thinks, the proposal to relax the Anglican rule, definitely excludes it. Confirmation in the Catholic Church is not, and never has been, a thing indifferent, to be followed or abandoned as various groups in the Church see fit. It is an Apostolic practice to which all Catholic Churchmen are bound. As Dr. Francis Hall puts it: "Of the Catholic precept in this matter there can be no question. Confirmation has always and everywhere constituted the normal sequel of Baptism, and never have the baptized been dispensed from receiving it when it could be obtained. Rejection of it has in all Catholic communions been followed by exclusion from Holy Communion." He adds that "it has to be remembered in this connection that the Catholic Church regards all the baptized as properly subject to Catholic discipline, and cannot consistently exempt Nonconformists because of their independent organization from the conditions which are imposed upon those who would enjoy Catholic privileges. *To do so would not only encourage Nonconformists in their Nonconformity, but would be prejudicial to the maintenance of discipline within* [our italics]. The Prayer Book rubric requiring Confirmation or readiness and desire to be confirmed before admission to Holy Communion is clearly designed to be applied without exception to all Christians who would fulfil their

'bounden duty and service' of receiving the body and blood of Christ and of participating in the Eucharistic Sacrifice. The intrenchment of Nonconformity in novel organizations designedly and persistently opposed to Catholic authority cannot annul for Nonconformists the principle that obedience to Catholic precepts is the only lawful basis of admission to Catholic privileges. And to reject Confirmation is to disobey a precept having New Testament as well as Catholic sanction" (*The Sacraments*, pp. 62-63).

II

In connection with the question of the necessity of Confirmation we wish to draw attention to an exceedingly precarious suggestion made by Dr. N. P. Williams in *Essays Catholic and Critical* (p. 411). "At first," he says, "it would seem, the illapse of the Spirit was mediated by the Baptism alone (Acts ii. 38). Later, when the Apostles began to be confronted by baptisms which did not produce the supernormal charismata which testified to the Spirit's presence, it was found, as at Samaria, that the imposition of the Apostles' hands was accompanied by the bestowal of what was lacking in the way of spiritual gifts; and thus, apparently, the impartation of the Spirit became specifically associated with the 'laying on of hands' as a distinct, though not yet separate, part of the rite. In this way what we call 'Confirmation' came into existence as embodying the positive effects of Initiation [*sc.*, the bestowal of the Spirit], the negative effects [*sc.*, the remission of sins] being specifically associated with the actual washing."

This statement is open to serious objection. It implies that Confirmation was a sort of accidental discovery whereby there was effected that which Baptism alone sometimes unaccountably failed to effect. Acts viii. 17 does not give the impression that the laying on of the Apostles' hands was an experiment (and it would be hazardous to suggest that the experiment had been made still earlier). If Baptism had at first secured both the remission of sins *and* the gift of the Spirit, and later seemed to fail to secure the gift of the Spirit (this failure being inferred from the absence of supernormal manifestations), how did the Apostles come to find out that this failure could be made good by the laying on of hands, and of theirs alone? And what could we say of a God Who left His means of grace to be discovered by such experimenting? Again, Dr. Williams' theory plays straight into the hands of the Nonconformists, who never practise Confirmation. On his theory, Confirmation is only necessary when Baptism fails to bestow the Holy Spirit. But how can we say with confidence when Baptism fails (if ever it

does fail) to do this? Nowadays even the confirmed do not display those supernormal charismata which the early Church regarded as the signs of the Holy Spirit's indwelling, but we do not therefore conclude that the Spirit has not been given. As far as outward proof goes, then, there is nothing to show that Confirmation ever adds anything that Baptism fails to bestow, and so, if the suggestion that Confirmation was merely an experimentally discovered way of making good the occasional failures of Baptism be true, it is no longer possible to insist on its necessity. At most it could only be urged that it is a sort of double security for the possession of the Spirit. Even so it would be impossible to maintain that it is the *only* rite that may be used for this purpose. For all we can tell, other experiments might be equally successful and therefore equally valid.

The difficulty that has led Dr. Williams to throw out his untenable suggestion is the well-known problem of distinguishing the grace of Baptism from the grace of Confirmation. There is no Catholic doctrine on the subject in the sense that there is unvarying teaching in the Church about it. Is the operation of the Holy Spirit which is the special grace of Confirmation the *beginning* of the Spirit's indwelling in us, or is it, so to speak, an extension and intensification of His indwelling which began at Baptism? Or is the indwelling effected once for all at Baptism, leaving Confirmation as merely a ceremony of admission to communicant status? Or ought we to get right behind either way of expressing the Spirit's relation to us?

The New Testament teaching is not very clear. Acts viii. 14-17 expressly declares that the gift of the Spirit followed, not Baptism, but the laying on of hands, and Acts xix. 5-6 is equally emphatic on the same side. On the other hand, there are numerous passages (*e.g.*, Acts ii. 38, 1 Cor. xii. 13) which seem to connect the gift of the Spirit with Baptism, though these could all be explained as references, not to Baptism simply, but to Baptism completed by the laying on of hands. Titus iii. 5 is possibly a reference to the two parts of the Sacrament of Initiation, and, if so, it connects the gift of the Spirit with the imposition of hands rather than with the washing. The earliest Father to mention Baptism and Confirmation separately (Tertullian) also connects the bestowal of the Spirit, not with Baptism, but with Confirmation: "The flesh is washed that the soul may be rid of its stains . . . the flesh is overshadowed by the imposition of the hand, that the soul may be illuminated by the Spirit" (*De Resurr. Carnis*, § 8). We have the same teaching still more clearly in St. Cyprian: "Two Sacraments preside over the perfect birth of a Christian, the one regenerating the man, which is Baptism, the other communicating to him

the Holy Spirit" (*Epist.*, lxxii.; *cf. Epist.*, lxxiv.). Darwell Stone (*Holy Baptism*, pp. 78-80), who defends the view that the Spirit's indwelling is effected by Baptism, does not deal with these passages from Tertullian and St. Cyprian. He does, however (pp. 80-81 and 244-249), quote another passage from Cyprian (*Epist.*, lxix. 13-15) in which Cyprian denies that those who have been clinically baptized receive "a more scanty and smaller measure of the divine gift of the Holy Spirit," and asserts that "the Holy Spirit is not given by measure, but is poured in His fulness upon the believer," so that in a baptized person "the Holy Spirit begins to dwell." But Cyprian is here contrasting clinical Baptism with Baptism in the face of the congregation, and there is nothing to show that the laying on of hands was not part of the clinical Baptism. Other Fathers could be quoted to the same effect, while quotations on the opposite side could be explained as due to the tacit combination of Confirmation with Baptism as one Sacrament of Initiation. The view that the Spirit's *indwelling* is effected, not by Baptism, but by Confirmation, was vigorously championed by Dr. A. J. Mason (*The Relation of Confirmation to Baptism*), but it labours under very serious difficulties. Dr. Mason admits the operation of the Spirit in Baptism, but tries to maintain that this operation is external, and not an indwelling, though he quite fails to explain how this can be. If, as our Catechism teaches, Baptism (apart from Confirmation) makes us members of Christ, how can we say that the Spirit of Christ does not dwell in us henceforth? Surely we cannot be members of Christ unless His Spirit dwells in us. Further, this theory exalts Confirmation, which the New Testament does not *certainly* trace back to Christ's ordinance, at the expense of Baptism, which it does trace back to Christ (see Tyrrell Green, *The Church of Christ*, pp. 223-225; Darwell Stone, *Holy Baptism*, pp. 67-74; and Essay VI. [by K. D. Mackenzie] in *Confirmation*, vol. i.). We urge further that if, as apparently St. Luke and some of the Fathers imply or affirm, the effect of Baptism is merely the negative remission of sins and our regeneration in the narrowest sense (without any indwelling of the Spirit), while Confirmation secures the Spirit's indwelling, then the Western Church (as Dr. Puller thought) has committed a grievous wrong in postponing Confirmation. It is taught that it is right to wait until "the years of discretion" have been reached, as though the Spirit's indwelling were not needed before this. Such teaching is based on a hopelessly out-of-date psychology. We have learnt that the influences of a child's early years are of primary importance for his future character, and if the Spirit's indwelling is of any use at all (which, of course, is not a matter of doubt) we ought, if we can,

to secure it as early as possible. It is no answer to say that our relationship with the Spirit must be consciously personal, and that it cannot be this in infancy. The Spirit, like the wind, bloweth where and how He listeth, and as a child has spiritual needs long before he becomes conscious of them, we ought to bring him within the sphere of covenanted grace as soon as possible. If the child has to wait until he is confirmed before the Spirit comes to dwell in him, he ought not to be kept waiting.

Now it is somewhat startling to find that the only New Testament passages upon which the view is based that the Spirit's indwelling is associated with Confirmation rather than with Baptism are the two passages already cited from Acts (viii. 14-17 and xix. 5-6). Titus iii. 5 would certainly not have given rise to this view had it stood alone. The question arises, How did St. Luke *know* that the bestowal of the Spirit was associated with the laying on of hands rather than with Baptism? We may say that Jesus had said that this would be so. Or we may say that the knowledge came to St. Luke by revelation. But there is another possibility. In Acts x. 44-46 he says: "While Peter yet spoke these words, the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word. . . . For they heard them speak with tongues and magnify God" (*cf.* xi. 15). Similarly in xix. 6 the statement that "the Holy Ghost came on them" is followed immediately by the words, "and they spake with tongues, and prophesied." We note also that in i. 8 the mark of the Spirit's indwelling is to be "power" (δύναμις), and the same idea pervades Acts ii. Do not these passages suggest very strongly that for St. Luke the sign of the Spirit's presence was abnormal behaviour (*cf.* also Acts viii. 39, xvi. 6-7)? It seems fair to suppose that if the imposition of the Apostles' hands upon the Samaritan converts was followed by extraordinary behaviour on the part of the converts, then St. Luke would readily infer that this was a sign that the Spirit had come upon them. Now he does not actually say that the Samaritans spoke with tongues or prophesied, but the words, "when Simon saw that through the laying on of the Apostles' hands the Holy Ghost was given," imply that there *was* something striking about their behaviour. Probably the explanation that this behaviour was a manifestation of the Spirit was given at the time, if we may suppose that Simon's request is in his actual words. If so, then St. Luke simply took over a view of the Spirit's activity which was current in the Church, as indeed the phenomenon of glossolalia at Corinth would suggest. We cannot here consider the whole question of the real nature of glossolalia, but from St. Paul's description of it at Corinth we think there is room for doubt whether it really was a "fruit of the Spirit." At any rate, we find the

"fruits of the Spirit" in Gal. v. 22-23 much more attractive. The point we would make here is that if St. Luke was dominated by the idea that abnormal behaviour was the peculiar sign of the Spirit's presence (an idea, of course, very prominent in the Old Testament, in which the doctrine of the Spirit is really usually deistic) he would, on seeing that in the cases mentioned in Acts abnormal behaviour followed the laying on of hands, naturally associate the Spirit's activity with the laying on of hands. And further if, as seems to have been the case, this abnormal behaviour was manifested *for the first time* at the laying on of hands, St. Luke would naturally represent the laying on of hands as the means of the *bestowal* of the Spirit. But manifestly this leaves room for the theory that the occasion of their Confirmation was not really the first time that these converts had become possessed of the Spirit. The case for the exclusive association of the bestowal of the Spirit with the laying on of hands simply disappears, and we are free (if we are so minded) to adopt the theory that the Spirit is given in *Baptism*. This seems to be the position taken up in our Baptismal Service, which speaks of the sanctifying of the child with the Holy Ghost, and in which we even pray, "Give Thy Holy Spirit to this infant, that he may be born again." Though Dr. Mason would describe this as an *external* operation of the Spirit, we have already seen that this is an unsatisfactory way of saving a theory to which we are not bound.

But what, then, is the special grace (if any) of Confirmation? Our Confirmation Service, with that mastery of ambiguity which is sometimes the salvation, but more often the curse, of the English Church, skilfully evades the question whether there is to be a first bestowal of the Spirit or merely an "extension" of His influence. The usual teaching in our Church is that given in the Preface of the new Order of Confirmation in the Revised Prayer Book—viz., "that a special gift of the Holy Spirit is bestowed through laying on of hands with prayer," so that we should pray that God "will strengthen with His Holy Spirit those who in Baptism were made His children." With this we may usefully compare the formula of Ordination: "Receive ye the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a priest" or "of a bishop." But this teaching is open to a special danger which is not by any means always avoided in our Church. Dr. Hall has a useful passage on this. "Such teaching," he says, "cannot reasonably be interpreted in terms of quantity, as if the Holy Spirit were given to some extent in Baptism and more abundantly in Confirmation. If the Spirit Himself is given at all, He must surely be given entirely. There is no more or less in His Person. The difference must be in the sense in which,

or the purpose for which, the Spirit is given in each case" (*op. cit.*, p. 27). He adds that "Scripture does not afford definite teaching on this point, but we may gather from its various allusions, and from the analogy of the Spirit's bestowal upon Christ's own Manhood, that, while we receive the Spirit in Baptism in so far as we are thereby *brought into Him* and become subjects of His sanctifying operations, we do not until Confirmation receive Him as a *formal and objective gift* [original italics]" (*ibid.*). This latter passage is too much coloured by the view we have been challenging, that the real indwelling of the Spirit does not begin until Confirmation. As Darwell Stone points out, the words in our Baptismal Service, "'Bestow upon them the Holy Spirit,' 'that all things belonging to the Spirit may live and grow in them,' are not phrases which can rightly be explained as meaning less than that at the reception of Baptism the Divine Person of God the Holy Ghost Himself enters into and abides in the human spirits of those persons to whom the rite is administered" (*Holy Baptism*, p. 69).

Now if it be true that it is by Baptism (without Confirmation) that the Spirit's indwelling is secured, and that "if the Spirit Himself is given at all, He must surely be given entirely," is there anything left for Confirmation to do by which we can rightly call it a Sacrament or means of grace? If Confirmation is not this, but is merely a ceremony of admission to full membership of the Church, can we rightly resist the South Indian proposal to make it but one of several admission ceremonies? Before we can answer this question there is a much deeper question to be considered.

A. E. MORRIS.

(*To be concluded.*)

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

The One Sacrifice (S.P.C.K., 4d.; cloth, 1s.) is the title of a little book of devotion compiled by the Rev. C. P. Hankey, Vicar of Little St. Mary's, Cambridge, who has had the collaboration of Mr. Will Spens. Many who have learnt much from the Master of Corpus's Eucharistic teaching have desired to see its devotional aspects more explicitly drawn out; and this is what this manual provides. A short theological statement and catechism on the relation of the Eucharist to the Cross are followed (pp. 12-20) by three "Considerations" which seem to us of the utmost value, as showing a deep insight into human nature and its difficulties over worship. We have rarely seen so much practical theological teaching packed into so small a compass. The remaining twelve pages contain devotions appropriate to the various "moments" of the liturgy, the liturgy itself not being printed. These prayers are at once beautiful and simple, and a welcome feature is the emphasis laid on the work of the Holy Spirit in the whole action of the service. We warmly commend this little manual to all whom our words may reach, not least to those who are preparing candidates for Confirmation.

NOTES ON PERIODICALS

The Journal of Religion. Vol. ix., No. 3.

The standpoint of this Journal is not ours, and we frequently find ourselves in violent disagreement. It is therefore all the more pleasing to express complete accord with "Beyond Science," the opening article of the current number. "There are not a few indications," says the writer, "that the next great absorbing form of human interest will lie in a realm beyond science." This is precisely the lesson we would ourselves have suggested to the Journal. The world of meaning, of spirit, and of value, as the article informs us, lies beyond science, for science as science knows not the person. The supreme worth, that is personality, is beyond science. The person exceeds, overlooks, evaluates everything. "It is because the scientist as well as the religionist, the artist, the philosopher is more than his pursuit that he, too, is unique, creative, indestructible, no mere instrument of nature, but *possessor* of mind and body, of talents and powers for which he is responsible. Born within nature, he is yet above nature. The first man is of the earth, earthy; the second man is the heavenly master. Little enough account of *him*, the person, has the scientist made. Yet we may not blame him for this, for science as science knows not the person. And yet the scientist is a man of mind, very decidedly so, else he were a poor scientist indeed, and also a man of character. As such he is himself a person, and in his application to his task, and more especially in those rare moments when he forgets for the time his speciality and becomes the lover, the father, the friend, the benefactor—perchance the worshipper—he subordinates science to humanism and transcends the world of nature—although then perhaps closest to its inner mystery and meaning. The North Pole has given up its secret, but the atom has not—much less the mind that conceives it.

What a set of unendurable prigs would be the self-inflated inhabitants of an exhausted and exploited world! Science has developed a method which is essential in all genuine truth-seeking, and a spirit of patient pursuit and readiness to revise conclusions, which is not only scientific, but moral—*i.e.*, superscientific. For this and for all its virtues and achievements it is worthy of all honour and the greater honour of furtherance. Yet the farther it advances the more its boundaries reveal themselves, and the more clearly it points beyond itself. Thereby we may discern more certainly the realms of unrealized knowledge and achievement which lie *beyond* science—the Beyond which is in very truth the power of our Here and Now." We agree. H. S. M.

Analecta Bollandiana. Tom. xlvii., fasc. 3 et 4.

This number begins with a summary and list of the extremely valuable MSS. at St. Omer, to which is added a useful index of the Saints referred to in them. There are, as would be expected, a large number of MSS. of English origin and interest, notably those relating to St. Thomas of Canterbury (one has five curious verses in it, giving the names of the murderers) and St. Anselm. Then a Latin life of St. Pansophios of Alexandria, of whom there are Armenian records also; this is more full than those previously known. Then a very careful criticism of the lives of St. Cunebert, one of the earliest of the Frankish Bishops, Archbishop of Cologne. There is the usual collection of extremely acute and valuable reviews, among which is to be observed the reference to the Dean of Wells, "dont l'ardeur au travail est infatigable," and that to Mr. R. W. Chambers' "charmante causerie" on Sir Thomas More. W. H. H.

Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique.

The October issue opens with Father Mollat's elaborate survey of the application of the droit de régale in the Church in France from the thirteenth to the fourteenth century. This article, like its predecessor, is based on a wide use of all the available authorities, and his inferences are every whit as valuable as his references. Fathers Peter and Poulet survey the constitutional Church of the North during the Terror, and they afford curious sidelights upon the French Revolution. Father Martin examines a supposed commentary of Severus of Antioch on the Acts of the Apostles. Father Gougaud, the well-known Celtic scholar, contributes notes on the contents of the archives of Great Britain. He makes suggestions for their preservation and for the facility of easier access to them.

Theologische Blätter. November.

A full report is given of the Conference of Eastern and Western theologians at Novi-Sad (Jugoslavia), August 3 to 10. This conference had been arranged by the commission, appointed at Stockholm, 1925, for œcumenical co-operation of theological professors. The principal subject of the conference was St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians. The chairman was Dr. Irenæus Ćirić, Bishop of Novi-Sad, and the Vice-chairman Dr. M. Dibelius, N.T. Professor at Heidelberg University. The various sections of the Epistle were treated by Dr. P. Bratsiotis (Athens), Professor K. L. Schmidt (Jena), Professor K. Beth (Vienna), Dr. N. Glubokovsky (Sofia), Professor H. Clavier (Montpellier), Professor Dodd

(Oxford), Professor S. Besobrasoff (Paris), Professor Bednař (Prague), and the final meditation was given by Bishop Irenæus of Novi-Sad.

Professor Bertram gives a report of the fifth International Congress for the general history of religion at Lund (Sweden), August 27 to 29. This was attended by many German and Swedish professors, by Mr. F. M. Cornford and Mr. S. A. Cook, of Cambridge; and Mr. E. R. Dodds, of Birmingham.

STUDIES IN TEXTS

(*a*) St. Matthew v. 48: *ἔσεσθε οὖν ὑμεῖς τέλειοι, ὡς ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος τέλειός ἐστι.*

A.V.: Be ye therefore perfect, even as your father, which is in heaven, is perfect.

R.V.: Ye therefore shall be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect.

The particular meaning of "perfect" is shown by the context to be love of enemies as well as of friends. Just as God sends rain on just and unjust, so are we to feel and show benevolence to all. There is no scope for explanations that refine away the meaning, as that man's *τέλος* is necessarily other than God's. "Perfect" means in Greek practically what it means in English. St. Luke's rendering of the saying is at first sight easier to understand: "Be ye merciful, even as your Father is merciful" (vi. 35). But he means the same as St. Matthew, and if we were merciful as God the Father, we should be perfect; God declares His almighty power most chiefly in showing mercy. The previous verse (vi. 35) has the *ἔσεσθε* of Matt. v. 45, "ye shall be sons of the Most High." The future of course indicates a command, as in Matt. v. 27 *οὐ μοιχεύσεις*, "Thou shalt not commit adultery," and v. 43 *ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου*, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour." The English future is used in this imperative sense just like the Greek.

Nevertheless the A.V. is better. I once heard a preacher expound the text. He said the common rendering was a stumbling-block. How could man be perfect? Readers were naturally discouraged by a command impossible to be obeyed. The R.V. had removed the difficulty by substituting the future for the imperative. "Ye shall be perfect"—*i.e.*, if ye do what has been commanded above, not otherwise. The correct usage of "shall" and "will" is natural to a native of Southern England, very difficult to inhabitants of other parts of these islands. If a reader who is uncertain about "shall" and "will" notices that the Revisers have abolished the imperative, he is quite likely to conclude that they meant to change the sense. The A.V. is a good rendering of the Greek and might well be allowed to stand.

(*b*) Acts v. 42: *εὐαγγελιζόμενοι τὸν χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν.*

"... preach Jesus Christ" A.V.
"... preach Jesus as the Christ" R.V.

The A.V. rendering is wrong, for *χρ.* Ἰ. is not in the Acts merely a composite title as in later times; each part of the phrase has its separate meaning, one being subject and the other predicate, as the use of the

article suggests. R.V. recognizes this but wrongly makes Ἰησοῦν the subject.

The apostles, preaching to the Jews after the Ascension, proclaimed the identity of the Messiah with Jesus of Nazareth. Various statements are recorded in the Acts embodying their message—as follows. The English is given in *oratio recta*.

iii. 18: προκατήγγειλε (ὁ θεὸς) . . . παθεῖν τὸν χριστὸν αὐτοῦ—God's Christ was preordained to suffer.

v. 42: οὐκ ἐπαύοντο διδάσκοντες καὶ εὐαγγελιζόμενοι τὸν χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν—the Christ is Jesus.

xviii. 5: διαμαρτυρόμενος τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις εἶναι τὸν χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν—the Christ is Jesus.

xviii. 23: ἐπιδεικνὺς διὰ τῶν γραφῶν εἶναι τὸν χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν—the Christ is Jesus.

The last example is specially instructive. The preacher starts with the well-known figure of the Messiah. He has come and His name is Jesus; this may be proved by the correspondence of His life and death with what the Scriptures said of the Messiah. The apostolic message began with the known—*i.e.*, the conception of the Messiah, and argued from it to what for most hearers was unknown, the historic Jesus.

An exception is found in Acts ix. 20-22. Saul of Tarsus proclaims Jesus, that He is the Son of God, and he proves to the Jews that Jesus is the Christ. After the overwhelming experience of his conversion he could hardly do other than start with Jesus.

In Jn. xx. 31 the purpose of the gospel is said to be that men may believe that Jesus is the Christ. The Jesus whose words and works have been described must be recognized as the fulfilment of the hopes of the Jewish race. "The Christ is Jesus" would be as inappropriate here as is "Jesus is the Christ" in the passages quoted from Acts.

W. K. L. C.

NOTES ON THE "TE DEUM"

[The Rev. G. H. Whitaker, Rector of Woughton, Bletchley, has kindly sent us the following text and translation of the *Te Deum*, with brief notes appended, which seem to us a useful reminder of how much we commonly miss in the way we treat this hymn at present.—Ed.]

Te Deum laudamus: Te Dominum confitemur,
Te æternum Patrem omnis terra veneratur.
Tibi omnes angeli, tibi Cæli et universæ Potestates,
Tibi Cherubin et Seraphin incessabili voce proclamant
"Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus, Dominus Deus Sabaoth,
Pleni sunt cæli et terra Majestatis gloriæ Tuæ."
Te gloriosus Apostolorum chorus,
Te Prophetarum laudabilis numerus,
Te Martyrum candidatus laudat exercitus,
Te per orbem terraram sancta confitetur Ecclesia.
"Patrem immensæ Majestatis,
Venerandum, verum, et unicum Filium,
Sanctum quoque Paraclitum Spiritum."
Tu Rex gloriæ, Christe,
Tu Patris sempiternus es Filius,

Tu ad liberandum suscepisti hominem; non horruisti Virginis uterum.
Tu devicto mortis aculeo, aperuisti credentibus regna cælorum,
Tu ad dexteram Dei sedes; in gloria Patris Judex crederis esse venturus.
Te ergo quæsumus, famulis Tuis subveni, quos pretioso sanguine redemisti:
Aeterna fac cum Sanctis Tuis gloria munerari.

Thee as God we praise, Thee as Lord we acknowledge,
Thee as eternal Father all the earth adores.
To Thee all angels, to Thee the Heavens and Powers universal,
To Thee Cherubim and Seraphim with voice unresting cry
"HOLY, HOLY, HOLY IS THE LORD GOD OF SABAOTH,
FULL ARE THE HEAVENS AND THE EARTH OF THE MAJESTY OF THY GLORY."
Thee the glory-filled choir of Apostles,
Thee the worshipful roll of Prophets,
Thee the white-robed army of Martyrs,
Thee throughout the world Holy Church acknowledges (when it says)
"THE FATHER OF INFINITE MAJESTY,
THE ADORABLE, TRUE, AND ONLY SON,
ALSO THE HOLY PARACLETE, LIFE-BREATH."
Thou art King of Glory, O Christ,
Thou of the Father everlasting Son;
Thou to set it free tookest manhood upon Thee, abhorrest not a Virgin's womb;
Thou, when Thou hadst vanquished Death's sting, didst open to believers sovereignties of the Heavens;
Thou at the Right Hand of God art seated; as Judge in the glory of the Father Thou art believed to be coming.
Thee, therefore, we implore, succour Thine Household, whom with precious Blood Thou hast redeemed:
Cause them together with Thy Saints to be dowered with eternal glory.

Obs. 1: The Structure of the Hymn was obscured by the versicles and responds, meant to be sung kneeling, being treated as part of it. They stand in Codex A at the end of the "Gloria in Excelsis."

Obs. 2: The Unity of the Hymn, shown by the "Tu," "Te," "Tibi," was obscured by (*a*) the Trisagion and the summary of the Creed not being made to stand out as *quotations*; (*b*) the failure to recognize that "*æternum Patrem*" is one of the four Names of our Lord in Isaiah ix. 6, where the R.V. margin tells us that "Everlasting Father" is in the Hebrew "Father of Eternity"; (*c*) the insertion of *Tuum* after *venerandum* in the summary of the Creed. I do not know whether there is MS. authority for its omission, but I venture to regard it as a manifest intruder.

Obs. 3: I do not know who is responsible for the amazing mistranslation of the opening words, nor whether any protest has ever been made against it.

Obs. 4: The Hymn, coming, like the "Quicunque," out of the Church's agony over the bringing back of Polytheism under the name of Arianism, consists of two parts. In the first part the Heavenly Hosts, the Church triumphant, and the Church militant, are called as witnessing to Christ's Godhead, by the "Holy, Holy, Holy" in the Heavenly Hymn, and the Threefold Name in the Creed. The second part sets forth His Work, as "everlasting Father" or "King of glory," as Bringer in of the Age to

come, as always and everywhere developing the Father's thought, as leading all who trust Him to eternal glory.

Obs. 5: "The sting of death is sin." The Epiphany of our Lord at the Jordan was the Epiphany of the Conqueror of sin. Sin had been vanquished by Jesus as Boy, Youth, Man at Nazareth.

Obs. 6: Can *regna cælorum* mean less than is stated in Apoc. i. 6. v. 10?

Obs. 7: For the connexion of the "glory of the Father" with our Lord's coming as Judge see Matt. xvi. 27; Mark viii. 38.

Obs. 8: The *ergo*, "therefore," at the close of the Hymn is an appeal to *all* that the Lord is and has done for us "Because Thou *art* King of glory and hast redeemed us be ever at hand to help us."

Obs. 9: *Numerari* is a scribe's or printer's error for *munerari*. The intrusion of *in* (before *gloria*) followed.

REVIEWS

DISESTABLISHMENT: THE VISITATION CHARGE DELIVERED AT THE SECOND VISITATION OF THE DIOCESE. By H. H. Henson, D.D., Bishop of Durham. Macmillan. 4s. 6d.

To those who remember the Bishop of Durham's earlier utterances, his championship of the cause of Disestablishment may appear as a rather startling *volte face*. But in the Introduction prefixed to his Visitation Charge, he fully justifies this change of opinion. "I have never," he says, "concealed from myself the anomalous character which the relations of Church and State had come to possess, nor failed to perceive the likelihood of that character becoming so exaggerated as to render Disestablishment morally indispensable." The Enabling Act was not dictated by "an intense dislike of the existing Establishment," but was a final effort to secure for the Church the spiritual autonomy that is essential to its life, without severing its age-long association with the State. But it did undoubtedly weaken the claim of the Church of England to be in any sense "the English Nation in its spiritual aspect." In a very interesting passage, the Bishop summarizes the impressions left on his mind by the Lambeth discussions on Prayer-Book Revision. He realized that the Church of England was no longer competent for its historic function as a National Church. "English religion is still strongly Protestant. The Church of England cannot truly be so described." Then he realized that a new conception of the Church of England was growing up, which looked to its larger office in the life of the whole Church. And, lastly, he saw that "the Church had already been disestablished in the minds of the Bishops." The rejection of the Revised Prayer Book completed Dr. Henson's conversion to the need of the liberation of the Church from its subjection to State control.

Is there any alternative? Some of us have thought that it was worth while to explore the method by which the Scottish Church has asserted its spiritual independence while retaining its place as the National Church of the Scottish people. This solution the Bishop regards as impracticable in this country, and it must be admitted that the English Church is far more closely entangled with the State than the Scottish Church has ever been. "In Scotland the assumption of the National Establishment has been the distinctness of Church and State, in England it has been their identity."

The two main arguments against Disestablishment are:

(i.) that the Church of England could no longer claim to be the religious organ of the English people. But the Church has long since lost any real right to this title. (ii.) That a disestablished Church would necessarily lose the comprehensiveness that has been a characteristic of the Church of England. It is even said that Disestablishment would inevitably be followed by disruption. But this assumption is entirely unwarranted. If we may judge by the case of Wales, Disestablishment is much more likely to evoke a new spirit of loyalty and sacrifice, and lead to a gradual disappearance of party antagonisms. Dr. Henson recognizes frankly that disendowment is the inevitable price of spiritual independence.

It is all to the good that a prominent leader of the Church of England should demand that the issue of Disestablishment should be frankly faced, and no adequate attempt has yet been made to answer his challenge. The pragmatic tendency of English mentality makes us indifferent to logical consistency, and the existing relations of Church and State go back to the beginning of our national history. We must not allow ourselves to be driven by mere resentment to a demand for freedom; the demand, if it comes, must be founded on the conviction that the Church of England can better fulfil the special task to which it is called when it is free from political associations. However strongly we regret the rejection of the Revised Prayer Book, we are bound to recognize that the motive for that rejection was not a desire to attack religion but a desire, however misguided, to protect it. While we cannot accept the repudiation by the House of Commons of the opening words of Article XX., we may reasonably ask whether the vote of the House is to be regarded as the expression of a settled policy—in which case Disestablishment is inevitable; or a wrong committed by men bewildered by the noisy clamour of a disloyal faction within the Church. Certainly English Churchmen must accustom themselves to visualize Disestablishment as a possibility, and recognize, more clearly than many of them do at present, that Establishment is never of the *esse* of the Church, and is of its *bene esse* only in so far as it does not compromise "the sovereign rights of Jesus Christ over His Church."

J. H. B. PLYMOUTH.

LUTHER AND THE REFORMATION (Vol. III.). By J. Mackinnon. Longmans. 16s.

This volume of Dr. Mackinnon's monumental study of Luther and his times covers the period from 1521 to 1529. At the beginning of it Luther is in retirement in the Wartburg, though

still in close touch with the Reformation Movement. Then comes his return to Wittenberg, the Peasants' Revolt, the Controversy with Erasmus, and the division of Protestantism on the question of the sacraments. Matters of great significance all of them, and handled as such by Dr. Mackinnon, who brings to his task a judicial and impartial mind, as well as wide and comprehensive knowledge. He has the additional merit of never allowing the reformer to be obscured by the events amidst which he moves.

Luther's retirement made it necessary for him to exercise his influence by a voluminous correspondence. In some of the letters which poured forth from his ready pen freedom of utterance verges on carelessness, and numerous examples are provided of that "propensity to utter things on the spur of the moment," as Dr. Mackinnon terms it (p. 13), which often made him his own worst enemy. The most notorious instance is, of course, the advice: "Be a sinner and sin vigorously," paradoxical language which was often used by opponents to discredit his doctrine of justification. On his return, Luther continued to write energetically, but now the opportunity of the spoken word was also his: and he used it largely in the endeavour to check the extremists who had taken advantage of his absence to quicken the pace of reform. By these means his own influence in Germany grew enormously up to the year 1524. Then came the Peasants' Revolt.

Luther had himself warned the nobles of Germany that a time was coming when they would not be allowed to ill-treat the common people with impunity. "The world is no longer the world of the old days," he pointed out, "when you could hunt and harass the people like game." In June, 1524, a trifling dispute in an obscure corner of the Black Forest (the Countess of Lupfen ordered the peasants on her lord's estate to leave their harvests in order to gather snails) provoked an outbreak which confirmed only too surely Luther's warning. The outbreak spread with alarming rapidity, and it was accompanied by occasional acts of foolish violence. The better spirits among the leaders, however, desired to move along wiser lines, and a manifesto was put forth, called the Twelve Articles, in which various reforms were demanded: this document shows obvious traces of Luther's own teaching. Luther at first made appeals to both sides; but very soon he came down heavily against the peasants, perhaps because many of the advanced reformers, who were his special aversion, were supporting the movement. Once having made up his mind he was satisfied with no half-measures, and in the spirit of an Old Testament prophet, a spirit far removed from that of the Gospel, he urged on the nobles to

suppress the revolt and to massacre those who offered resistance. Luther, as Dr. Mackinnon says (p. 205), had "clearly lost his head," but even so, in calmer moments, with characteristic doggedness he defended himself for his outburst, and even gloated over the consequent slaughter. "It was I, Martin Luther, who slew all the peasants during the rising, for I commanded them to be slaughtered. All their blood is on my head. But I throw the responsibility on our Lord God, who instructed me to give the order." Could blind fanaticism go further?

The controversy with Erasmus over the question of Freewill, in its earlier stages at any rate, showed Luther at his best. He had an opponent for whom he still had respect, and in consequence he avoided language of an insulting and provocative nature. Later on, however, when Erasmus, a little unkindly perhaps, had remarked that Luther's wedding had turned the Reformation from a tragedy into a comedy, the latter, touched on the raw, again "lost his head," and no words were too coarse for his pen. Into the details of the controversy one cannot enter, but I must protest against the idea that Erasmus was moved by jealousy to attack Luther. I am also not prepared to accept Dr. Mackinnon's verdict that Luther, as a thinker, showed great superiority over Erasmus (p. 266). That he was more vehement everyone would admit, and that he knew exactly what he believed and the reason why everybody else was wrong. But such an attitude of mind, though it may conduce to clear statement, does not necessarily lead to accurate thinking. I am much more disposed to agree with Dr. Mackinnon when he admits, on another occasion (p. 313), that Luther, in argument, had "a contempt for reason."

It seems impossible for anyone to do justice both to Luther and to Erasmus: one is evidently born an Erasmian or a Lutheran. In this connection I am interested to notice that Dr. Mackinnon is by no means satisfied with the account of Luther in the second of my Hulsean Lectures: he condemns it, in language a little reminiscent of Luther himself, as "a series of generalizations based on secondhand sources" (p. 233). This attack is hardly justified, as in the introduction to the Lectures (*Erasmus the Reformer*, pp. ix. f.) I admitted that the account dealt with only one side of the reformer, and other factors were required to make a complete, and therefore a fair, presentation. The strange thing is, however, that, after reading Dr. Mackinnon's own account, I do not feel that there is any grave difference in our estimate of him.

With the estimate of Erasmus I am not prepared to agree. In spite of the fact that Erasmus knew nothing of struggles similar to those through which Luther had gone, and that he

was inclined to over-emphasize the value of humanism, he was at bottom in deadly earnest. Dr. Mackinnon, led away by Erasmus's seeming frivolity, fails to realize this. But how could a Scotchman (unless he were Marcus Dods) understand such humour? This lack is seen in his taking Erasmus to task for admitting that, had he been in Luther's place at Worms, he would have played the part of Peter. The original story might have reminded Dr. Mackinnon that those who play the part of Peter are not usually aware of the fact beforehand. Erasmus, as so often, is being ironical at his own expense.

The disagreement with the Zwinglians, which led up to the Marburg Conference, is admirably described: the essential points are well brought out, and all parties to this unfortunate dispute are given full justice. Luther is exhibited in his strength and in his weakness. On the one hand there was the loyalty which would not allow him to accept any but a literal interpretation of the words of institution in the Lord's Supper—the fierceness with which he defended what he held to be right; and, on the other hand, there is no attempt to conceal the narrowness and bitterness which made him act like a sulky child. At the close of the Conference, when negotiations had broken down, Zwingli, with tears in his eyes, begged that they might still be friends. But Luther would have none of it; there could be no community of spirit with one who undermined the Word of Christ with sacrilegious arguments. "Pray God," he added, "that you may be converted." After what had passed this pious utterance was too much for Œcolampadius, and he flashed back: "Pray God yourself, for you stand equally in need of conversion."

Luther did a great work, but not in an entirely great manner. The clue to his failure, it seems to me, lies in the fact that he was by nature a conservative, and that his religious convictions in reaction against their surroundings forced him to be a rebel. There was a constant internal struggle, and this caused those outbreaks of fury against men who differed from him but slightly which are so puzzling to the student of the Reformation. His strength lay in his genius for religion, and also in his being a typical German. (The coarseness which was continually breaking out in his writings was an advantage to him in this latter respect, for it made his fellow-countrymen feel that he was one of themselves.) But, like all men of religious genius, he tended to make his own experiences the norm by which everything was to be judged. Unfortunately Luther was neither a clear thinker nor an ecclesiastical statesman: hence the misunderstandings and controversies, many of them quite unnecessary, in which he became involved, to the great hurt of the cause to which his life had been dedicated.

L. Elliott Binns.

JESUS-JESHUA. STUDIES IN THE GOSPELS. By Gustaf Dalman. Authorized Translation by the Rev. Paul P. Levertoff. S.P.C.K. 15s.

The latest work of Dr. Gustaf Dalman consists mainly of conjectures concerning the original Aramaic of our Lord's utterances, together with a great number of quotations from, and references to, Jewish literature by way of illustrating not only His words, but also the thought and the customs of the days in which He lived on earth. Although these quotations and references are in themselves of great interest, it must be admitted that in not a few cases they can be regarded as relevant only if the interpretation which Dalman puts upon our Lord's sayings be adopted; and this interpretation will not commend itself to all students of the New Testament. Moreover, in connection with the postulated original Aramaic of our Lord's words, Dalman's retranslation is frequently by no means convincing either as to the vocabulary adopted or the pronunciation of the words. It is much to be regretted that throughout the book the Aramaic is presented in a transliterated form. Had it been printed in what is commonly known as the square Hebrew characters, readers with some knowledge of Aramaic would have been able not only to read it far more easily, but also to avoid giving it a pronunciation which there is good reason to regard as belonging to an age considerably later than that of our Lord. As every critical student of the Massoretic text of the Old Testament knows, the pronunciation of Aramaic in the first half of the first century of our era must have been between what is indicated by the *k'thîbh* and the *ḳ'rî*, and probably nearer to the former. It must further be remembered that the *matres lectionis* appear to have been more freely used in Aramaic than in the (generally) more accurate Hebrew orthography, and there is no reason for supposing that vowels so indicated were necessarily long. Many of Dalman's transliterations, therefore, will mislead those who imagine that with the help of his book they will be able to reproduce the sounds of words which actually fell from our Lord's lips.

It is to be noted that the treatment of the *b'ghadhk'phath* letters in the transliterations follows in the main the pronunciation of the Sephardic Jews—that is to say, it ignores the distinction between *dāghûsh* and *rāphē*; it is, however, not consistent, as will be evident from such forms as *bet malkhūtā*, *sāferin*.

It is, however, not only in regard to pronunciation that Dalman's retranslations into Aramaic are unsatisfactory; the choice of words is frequently open to question. As is well known, the material for reconstructing the Palestinian Aramaic *of our Lord's time* is very meagre; and in regard to diction the

evidence of the Gospels, although they are written in Greek, is of first-rate importance. We have no right to assume that because a particular word does not occur in the Palestinian Aramaic documents which survive, it could not have been used by our Lord. Thus, to give an example, Dalman postulates as the original of πεπλήρωται (Luke iv. 21) *itḳaiyam* (p. 48), maintaining (p. 57) that "in Jewish Palestinian only the Hebrew *ḳiyyēm* and the Aramaic *ḳaiyēm* correspond to 'fulfil.'" It would, however, have been strange indeed if Hebrew phraseology had not affected the vocabulary of Aramaic-speaking religious people; and πληροῦν corresponds so closely to the Hebrew *millē*, which in one or other of the conjugations occurs in passages as late as 2 Chronicles xxxvi. 21, Daniel x. 3, that it is scarcely possible to doubt that it represents some form of the same root in our Lord's utterances.

Dalman's treatment of some of the Aramaic words which are found in the New Testament is likewise open to criticism. Thus he states (p. 13) that "*rabbūnī* (=rabbōnī) with which the blind man in Jericho (Mark x. 51) and Mary Magdalene (John xx. 16) addressed our Lord, is without doubt Aramaic." As a matter of fact, however, the form of the word is not Aramaic but Hebrew; and it was just as natural that a teacher or master should be designated by a Hebrew word among Aramaic-speaking people as it is that a Scottish schoolmaster should be designated by a Latin word. The form ῥαββουνεὶ merely illustrates a fact that is otherwise sufficiently clear—viz., that in the first century of the Christian era *ă* had not been thinned to *ĭ*, while of the deepening of *ŏ* to *û* there are many examples in the Massoretic pointing.

The Aramaic word represented by ἐφφαθὰ is given (p. 11) as *itpattaḥ*. The Greek spelling, however, implies the *Ithp' 'el* rather than the *Ithpa 'al*. It is unlikely that in pronunciation the *taw* was assimilated to the *pe*, and the first φ is probably merely a scribed blunder for θ. In like manner Βοανηργὲς (Mark iii. 17) appears to have arisen *in the Greek* from the misplacing of the *o*, the correct form being Βανηρόγες. There is abundant evidence that *ă* had not as yet been worn down to a mere *sh'wā*, and in the older Palestinian Aramaic, segholate nouns occasionally preserve the stem vowel after the first radical.

More than half the book (pp. 86-222) consists of two dissertations entitled respectively "The Passover Meal" and "At the Cross," and these will, no doubt, be eagerly read. An adequate discussion of them would far exceed the limits of this article; it must suffice to state that the conclusions arrived at will not commend themselves to all New Testament scholars. Dalman argues that the Last Supper was an actual Passover meal, but

he scarcely does justice to the many difficulties with which this theory is beset. The retranslation of our Lord's words (Luke xxii. 18) which is given on p. 182 is by no means convincing, while the interpretation of those words (p. 155) is remarkable: "St. Luke (xxii. 18) lets the concluding words come at the beginning of the meal, so that, according to him, our Lord, while desiring to *eat* of the Passover for the last time, refused altogether to drink the wine."

It may be noted that Dalman, though he refers to Jeremiah xxxi. 31 f. (p. 164), regards our Lord's words as given by St. Paul (1 Cor. xi. 25) as based on Exodus xxiv. Here he might claim the support of Westcott and Hort's Greek Testament, where the words given in 1 Corinthians xi. 25 are regarded as quoted from Exodus xxiv. 8 and Zechariah ix. 11. But it is surely unnecessary to suppose that our Lord had in mind Exodus xxiv. with its grossly material description of the theophany; for Jeremiah xxxi. 31 f., which comes far nearer to His teaching, mentions not only a "new covenant," but also one which Israel had made void, a "covenant" which was inaugurated with Israel's fathers "in the day that" Jehovah "took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt"—*i.e.*, not at Sinai, but in Egypt, on the occasion of the first Passover. That the Hebrew word *b'rîth*, of which "covenant," like διαθήκη, is a conventional rendering, does *not* necessarily imply anything of the nature of a *bargain* or *agreement*, but merely peaceful relations between two parties—immunity from hostility or attack—is sufficiently evident to anyone who will bring a little common sense to bear on the interpretation of such passages as Genesis ix. 9 f., Hosea ii. 18, Job v. 23.

ROBERT H. KENNETT.

NOTICES

RELIGION IN HUMAN AFFAIRS. By C. Kirkpatrick, Ph.D. Chapman and Hall. 17s. 6d.

When a professor of sociology sets out to review the place of religion in human affairs, it is to be understood that he regards religion as a department of culture, and that he will claim to review it in all its forms with severe detachment. Thus it is with this volume which comes from the University of Pennsylvania. "No attempt will be made," says Dr. Kirkpatrick, "to pass judgment on the ultimate truth or falsity of religious beliefs, for that is the field of theology and philosophy. We are interested solely in observable facts and their relationships, and merely seek to understand rather than to praise or blame religious beliefs and customs" (p. 6). So we find the writer presently introducing an imaginary enquirer (p. 141), who seeks to be informed why, if religion is based on hallucinations, dream experiences and the like, it has been able to survive

so many thousands of years, and, as in duty bound, he refrains from answering that perhaps it is because it is really well founded, but proceeds to suggest, after Leuba, that in addition to its occasional luck in the form of answers to prayer, it has survival value in certain unsought results such as the satisfaction of a craving for power, the imparting of mental stimulus and solace and hope, the reinforcement of custom and the provision of a bond of social unity. Later, when ethical standards are in question (p. 445), "the social teachings of Jesus" are quietly set on one side as inapplicable to a complex industrial civilization. They are vague, and they have no force or sanction beyond their intrinsic merit. "Should not ethical standards be set up," we are asked, "on the basis of sound knowledge of economics, sociology, political science, history, anthropology, psychology, mental hygiene and the like?" And it is declared on the authority of Conybeare's *Myth, Magic and Morals* that after all "no one knows what the words of Christ were," and further that "of course the more generally recognized Christian virtues were old at the time of Christ, having been proclaimed many years before in China and elsewhere."

From this it will be seen how much the writer's refusal to pass judgment is worth. For all his suave and hypothetical forms of statement, religion is viewed by Dr. Kirkpatrick as on the whole inimical to social development at the present stage. Yet he does not feel able to forecast its early disappearance before the advance of science, but closes his book rather sadly with the thought that men will be found living in close touch with "an unseen world" (the article is important) for another hundred thousand years.

If it is any satisfaction to the writer it may be said without hesitation that such a book as this will do more harm to religion than many a direct and slashing attack on Christian theology and ethics. It gives an impression of wide knowledge; it is gentle and unprovocative in its rejection of belief in the supernatural, and, though it suggests very plainly that the future is with sociology and that all really well educated people know it, it avoids any suspicion of superiority. Various types of American Christianity are all too easily and fairly portrayed as false and offensive, or smart and foolishly up-to-date, and sociology wins an easy victory by contrast. Yet the professor must know, as a well-read man, that unimpeachable scholarship is able to tell a very different story about the Christian religion from that which is here set forth, and that, in spite of the vagaries of some who claim to profess it, it remains a way of life based upon a faith which interprets the scheme of things with a greater comprehensiveness and a more obvious mastery than sociology can ever hope to achieve. It looks before and after, and in the light of its knowledge of origins and purpose and an appointed goal it apprehends absolute values, and tests the changing standards of the ages as they pass. Also, it produces great men and women whose influence upon the social order is profound. Sociology might at least be expected to take account of these.

O. HARDMAN.

ANFÄNGE REFORMATORISCHER BIBELAUSLEGUNG. Edited by J. Ficker. Luther's *Vorlesung über den Hebraerbrief*, 1517-18. Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung. Leipzig.

In the year 1517 Luther was an orthodox Churchman who was grieved by the abuses he noted in the Church, but he noted them as a member

unwilling to give rise to schism. That year he nailed up his ninety-five Latin theses, denouncing the sale of indulgences, and we do not wonder when we remember the popular rhyme on the teaching of Tetzel:

> The moment the money in the coffer rings
> The soul out of Purgatory springs.

With ideas like this he gave his lectures on the Epistle to the Hebrews, which Herr Ficker capably edits. Unless we are mistaken, this is the first time for these lectures to be printed. Their purport was known, for Luther, in his desire for guidance, inevitably fastened upon the first great philosophy of history from a Christian point of view. The editor gives us a careful print of the Latin text of these lectures with footnotes on the variant readings. These notes are accompanied by general ones, and these leave nothing to be desired. They are short and to the point, giving pertinent references and parallel passages. There is an index of the texts quoted and a general one, and both are admirable. Herr Ficker has collated manuscripts at the Vatican, Dessau, Zwickau, Halle, Weimar, and Wittenberg, and he has consulted books at Berlin, Munich, Stuttgart, and Zurich. In a word, he has spared neither time nor trouble to give us a thoroughly satisfactory edition. He considers this new commentary of Luther inferior in scope and worth to the well-known one on the Epistle to the Romans, and with this verdict we are in complete agreement. At the same time the formative years are all-important, and we are glad to read this fresh evidence of the state of the mind of the reformer when he was thirty-one.

ROBERT H. MURRAY.

THE SUMMA CONTRA GENTILES OF SAINT THOMAS AQUINAS. Literally translated by the English Dominican Fathers. The Fourth Book. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 12s.

This concluding volume corresponds with the Third Part of the *Summa Theologica*, with the exception that it contains the doctrine of the Trinity, which there appears in the First Part. Perhaps nothing in this book is more worth our study than the Thomist theory of the Trinity in God of Mind, Thought, and Will (see especially pp. 47 *ff*., 85 *ff*., 115), as a corrective to the crude tritheistic notions which we often meet. From this St. Thomas passes on to an exhaustive discussion of Christology, and thence to the Sacraments and the Last Things. One cannot help noticing the points which the mediæval theologian omits. There is no attempt to give a doctrine of the Church; the Unity of the Church is only mentioned in passing, under the Sacrament of Holy Order; nor is there any serious discussion of any aspect of the Eucharist except the Real Presence—not even the Sacrifice.

For the successful completion of this work the Dominican Fathers deserve our congratulations and our thanks. They have in effect made the *Summa contra Gentiles* available for the first time for English readers; for the Latin text is not readily procurable. And the fact that it is arranged in the form of continuous discourse instead of disputations will make it for many readers a more attractive presentation of the Thomist theology than the *Summa Theologica*.

A. G. HEBERT, S.S.M.

THE THIRD ORDER OF SAINT FRANCIS. By Father Oswald, O.S.F.C. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 1s. 6d.

These three lectures addressed to the Franciscan Summer School by a Franciscan of the First Order are not of a "popular" kind; they assume a good deal of knowledge of the history of Europe from the twelfth century, and of the position of St. Francis of Assisi and his followers. The first lecture not only describes the founding of the Third Order; it shows us how wonderfully it fitted to the necessities of the times. Fr. Oswald will not consider the theory that the First and Second Orders sprang from the Third. He is quite clear that the little band who gathered round St. Francis when he vowed himself to Lady Poverty were the Franciscan Friars of the future, just as the maidens who followed St. Clare to her retreat were the earliest members of the Order of Poor Clares. The Third Order or Tertiaries came into existence when men and women, fired by the example of complete surrender, clamoured for some share in the privilege of destitution. Rich and poor, men and women, were banded together under a common rule which could be kept without repudiating the obligations of family life. These were the Brothers and Sisters of the Order of Penance. The Rule, its date, its authorship, and its provisions, are considered very carefully, and we see how definitely it reflects the spirit of St. Francis. This first lecture is valuable to anyone drawn to Franciscan studies, it is inspired by the spirit of the historian eager in quest of fact, and the latter part of the second which treats of the influence of the Tertiaries in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries is no less admirable. The personal histories of various saintly men and women of the period, who are believed to have been members of the Third Order with which the second lecture opens, break the sequence for the reader, although they may have been welcomed by an audience.

The third lecture deals with difficult material. It attempts a survey of five centuries and an examination of evidence as to the importance of the Third Order at the present time. The field is vast, there may be Tertiaries in every quarter of the globe, but a record of their number will not show the spread and deepening of the influence of the Poverello. Far more significant than any statistics is the account of the action of Leo XIII. Deliberately and after much consultation he so altered the Constitution and the Rule that members of the Third Order could be honest in obedience and still bear their part in the life going on around them. No doubt the wise Pope saw in the true spirit of St. Francis the remedy for the agony of the world. If Tertiaries of sincere practice were sufficiently numerous, the warfare of classes or of nations must die out. We may imagine that the problems of the twentieth century are more intricate than those of the thirteenth, but Charity, as understood by the Poverello, is the only solution for most of them. This seems to be the lesson Fr. Oswald means to convey, and his tone and method should arouse the interest of many who have no connection with the Franciscan Summer School.

One point remains for comment. Readers who are familiar with the life and work of Frederick Ozanam will be surprised to find him included among celebrated Tertiaries. Yet his name is given special prominence here as being among the most glorious inscribed on the roll of honour, and there is an account of his career. Ozanam founded in France a Society which revived the work of the "Conferences" of St. Vincent de Paul. Its aim was service rather than sanctification, but it demanded nothing of its

members that was not implied by the Tertiaries Rule. It is difficult to believe that he would have avoided reference to the great Order of which his enterprise was a reflection if he had belonged to it. Fr. Oswald, indeed, admits that he has "no positive evidence" of his membership. Ozanam had just the qualities to be desired in a son of St. Francis, but the records that concern him are against the suggestion that he ever became one.

E. K. SANDERS.

SIBYLS AND SEERS. By Edwyn Bevan. Allen and Unwin. 7s. 6d.

Under this alluring title is published a series of most valuable lectures by a scholar as wise as he is learned. The first deals with knowledge of the spirit-world, and the theories held as to the manner in which it is attained. It shows that Liberal Protestantism, which believes in the One Spirit, but not in angels or devils, is a curious half-way house between Catholicism and Rationalism. Again, Protestantism is most illogical in maintaining that the One Spirit influences human lives, so do incarnate spirits, but never discarnate human spirits. However, the illogicality is easily explained by fear of the superstitions which have accompanied belief in the influence of the spirit-world.

The ancient idea of spirit communications differed strikingly from the modern. St. Paul is the only *real* person we know of in antiquity who had an experience which he believed to be a visit to the other world; there are, of course, many legendary accounts of such visits. Necromancy was on completely different lines from modern Spiritualism. There was nothing resembling a *séance*. The spirit was called up by the spells of the magician. The visitors from the other world are never represented as conveying information from their side; they are always concerned with the affairs of this world.

The special value of the book lies in its scientific treatment of the concept of inspiration by one who knows the lowly origin of much that passes by its name, and is an expert in comparative religion, but yet believes that God uses lowly means through which to declare His will.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

BOOK NOTES

Men and Movements in the Church of England. By F. A. Iremonger. Longmans. 4s. 6d. The late editor of *The Guardian* revived with brilliant success the literary custom of interviews, in a series of articles here reprinted in book form. Men like the Archbishop of York, the Bishops of Chichester, St. Albans, Birmingham, and Manchester, the Deans of Canterbury and St. Paul's, Lord Hugh Cecil, and Mr. Clayton here give their answers to Mr. Iremonger's searching questions. Their views are already well known, but the book loses none of its interest on this account. As a record of what the Church is thinking it is incomplete. The majority of priests and laymen move reluctantly, feeling that, though movement is inevitable, the more pressing duty is to hold fast by the things that cannot be shaken. Their point of view is not represented.

F. B. Meyer: Preacher, Teacher, Man of God. By A. Chester Mann. Allen and Unwin. 3s. 6d. Dr. Meyer, the Wesley of our days, the

Archbishop of Nonconformity—titles given him by admirers—was one of the greatest forces for righteousness in our generation. When he died, a figure of rare simplicity, goodness and attractiveness was taken from our midst. This American biography can be strongly recommended to Anglican readers who would learn about the best side of English Nonconformity. It is short and competent. Inevitably, being a book written a few weeks after the death of its subject, it fails to show adequately the deeper springs of a beautiful life. As a biography it misses the mark; as a chronicle of external activities it is excellent.

The Eastern Orthodox Church. By S. Zankov, S.C.M. 5s. The German original of this was reviewed at some length in our columns in April, 1929. We warmly welcome the English translation which has now appeared, thanks to the enterprise of the Student Christian Movement.

The Perfect Offering. By A. Hambrook. Mowbray. 6d. A good specimen of the new style of Eucharistic Manual in which worship of the Father in and through the Son, rather than Jesus-worship, is inculcated. The service is divided into three sections—the Outer Court, the Holy Place, the Holy of Holies. In parts of the service, *e.g.* the prayer of thanksgiving, alternative devotions are provided for those who are not communicating. Sometimes rather inferior verses of hymns are suggested for use. Thus, after the Prayer of Consecration, a verse of Adoration beginning: "Silence holds, O God; holds deep the knee to Thy divine Majesty; present so wondrously . . ."

The Catholic Directory. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 3s 6d. This monster book gives a mass of accurate information about a subject of great importance, the present position of the Roman Catholic Church in England.

Henry Parry Liddon. A Centenary Memoir. By the Bishop of Oxford, Bishop Talbot, Darwell Stone, A. B. Emden, and W. M. Whitley. Mowbray. 1s. These brief and attractively written papers deal with the character and influence of Dr. Liddon at Christ Church and elsewhere, and form a fitting tribute in the centenary year of his birth.

From the Heart of Motherhood. Longmans. 3s. 6d. Sincere and deeply religious poems which would help an expectant mother of the educated classes. Mr. John Oxenham in a preface describes them as "in chaste and beautiful language, the gradually intensifying and uplifting thoughts of a mother on the near and nearer approach of the great day that would see the birth of her first child."

"The Enabling Act" and Constitution. By Albert Mitchell. Church Book Room. 1s. A new edition of this useful handbook is prefaced by a survey of the first ten years of the new system of Church government, which contains some searching criticism. The Central Board of Finance has succeeded in becoming the financial executive of the Assembly, which, however, has little effective control over its policy. The system of reporting the most trivial remarks in the full sessions and passing over in silence the sessions of the House of Bishops is open to grave objection. The House of Bishops has increased its powers, as against both individual bishops and the parochial clergy. The inherent weakness of the Assembly is due to the fact that it is modelled on Parliament, but the Government is irremovable and irresponsible. Is the Church, concludes Mr. Mitchell, "a more effective instrument for righteousness than was the Church in 1919, or, shall we say, 1914 ?"

IV. Ezra: A Study in the Development of Universalism. By C. G. Montefiore. Allen and Unwin. 2s. In 4 Ezra (2 Esdras) God tells Ezra that the majority of mankind must be lost, but adds: "Dost thou love the creation more than I its creator?" In the fascinating lecture here printed Dr. Montefiore uses this as a text from which to trace the growth of Universalism. He does full justice to the moral fervour which inspires the Christian belief in hell but clearly looks upon Universalism as the only creed for the modern educated man; it is gradually pervading Judaism, whose doctrine of hell was inspired by racial prejudices—it was always mainly peopled by Gentiles—rather than by dogma. But he does not deal with the larger issues raised in von Hügel's superb essay on Heaven and Hell.

Voces Clamantium: The Clergy and the Church Assembly. Faith Press. 2s. 6d. It is a thankless task to act as a voice on behalf of the clergy, who are said to be suffering from the depression of their status in relation to the bishops on the one hand and the laity on the other. One thinks of the great Servant of Isaiah liii., who, when he was oppressed, opened not his mouth, and opens a book of this kind with apprehensions. Fortunately they prove to have been groundless. The position is stated with studious moderation and in the best of taste; the indictment of the Assembly, or rather of its official party, is not pressed home. To those who want to understand the clerical point of view at the present time this little book is indispensable. The Chapters deal with Clerical Poverty and the Appointment of Bishops (H. C. Bell); the Ecclesiastical Commissioners and Queen Anne's Bounty (E. A. Berry); Diocesan Synods (J. V. Bullard); Discipline in the Church (F. G. Ackerley); the Curate Question (C. E. Douglas); and Patronage (Bishop Frodsham). The most interesting chapter is on Clerical Poverty. The contention that clerical families should be provided with the social amenities of the upper middle class would be disputed by many.

W. K. L. C.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY BILLING AND SONS LTD., GUILDFORD AND ESHER